The University of Chicago

THE INDICATIVE INDIRECT QUESTION IN LATIN

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF LATIN

BY

ALICE FREDA BRÄUNLICH

Private Edition, Distributed By
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1920

The University of Chicago

THE INDICATIVE INDIRECT QUESTION IN LATIN

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF LATIN

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

BY

ALICE FREDA BRÄUNLICH

Private Edition, Distributed By
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1920

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41546816_0041

PREFACE

The writing of this dissertation was suggested to me by Professor Hale and has been carried out under his direction. With the title, "The Indicative Indirect Question in the Latin of the Republican Period," my doctoral dissertation was completed in 1913. At Professor Hale's suggestion, it was subsequently enlarged to its present scope.

To Professor Hale I am indebted, not only for the subject and plan of this paper, but also for generous help in the execution of the plan, for many of the examples from Latin authors, for terminology, and for methods of work. While he is not to be held responsible for every detail of the paper, yet he has carefully guided my investigation throughout its course and has read and criticized the entire dissertation, both in its earliest draft and in its all-but-final form.

I acknowledge my indebtedness for help and encouragement in research, also to all the other members of the departments of Latin, Greek, and Comparative Philology, of the University of Chicago, and especially to Professor Beeson, who read and criticized this entire paper in one of the early drafts and has since made numerous valuable suggestions, and to Professor Prescott, who has generously aided me in the textual study of many of the citations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

BIBLIOGRAPHY ix

INTRODUCTION

I. Review of Various Studies and Opinions Concerning the Indicative Indirect Question xvii

II. Purpose and Method of This Study xxviii

PART I. A STUDY OF THE CONSTRUCTION TO THE END OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE

CHAPTER I. AN ATTEMPT AT DEFINING THE DIRECT AND THE INDIRECT QUESTION 1

CHAPTER II. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: INDIRECT OR DIRECT QUESTIONS

I. Questions Whose Interpretation is Indifferent 6

II. Questions which if an Indicative Indirect Question Exists, are more Naturally Interpreted as Indirect, rather than as Direct.

1. Introductory 9
2. Indications that Questions are Indirect, Rather than Direct and not Quoted 10
3. Examples of Questions More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect, than as Direct and Not Quoted 12
4. Indications that Questions are Indirect, Rather than Directly Quoted 24
5. Examples of Questions More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect than as Directly Quoted 26

CHAPTER III. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: INDIRECT QUESTIONS OR EXCLAMATIONS

I. Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent 29

II. Clauses Which, if an Indicative Indirect Question Exists, are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Exclamations

1. Indications that Clauses are Indirect Questions Rather than Exclamations 31
2. Examples of Clauses More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Exclamations 33

CHAPTER IV. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: INDIRECT QUESTIONS OR RELATIVE CLAUSES

I. Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent
1. Introductory 44
2. Examples of Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent 45
II. Clauses Which, if an Indicative Indirect Question Exists, are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Relative Clauses
1. Indications that Clauses are Indirect Questions Rather than Relative Clauses 52
2. Examples of Clauses More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Relative Clauses 56

CHAPTER V. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: INDIRECT QUESTIONS OR CONDITIONS

I. Introductory: Review of Opinions Concerning the Interrogative Use of "Si" 75
II. Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent
1. Introductory 76
2. Examples of Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent 78
III. Clauses which, if an Indicative Indirect Question Exists, are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Conditions
1. Indications that Clauses are Indirect Questions Rather than Conditions 79
2. Examples of Clauses More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Conditions 80

CHAPTER VI. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: MISCELLANEOUS 85

CHAPTER VII. THE PROOFS THAT CLAUSES ARE INDIRECT QUESTIONS

I. The Discrimination of the Indirect Question from All Other Kinds of Clauses 87
II. The Discrimination of the Indirect from the Direct Question 87
III. The Discrimination of the Indirect Question from the Exclamation .. 91
IV. The Discrimination of the Indirect Question from the Relative Clause 92
V. The Discrimination of the Indirect Question from the Condition 94

CHAPTER VIII. CLAUSES WHICH, IF THE SOLE OR BEST MANUSCRIPT TRADITION IS FOLLOWED, ARE CERTAINLY INDICATIVE INDIRECT QUESTIONS 96

CHAPTER IX. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSION 105

CHAPTER X. THE DISPOSAL OF THE INDICATIVE INDIRECT QUESTION BY EMENDATION 106

PART II. A SUPPLEMENTARY STUDY OF THE CONSTRUCTION IN LATER LATIN

CHAPTER I. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: INDIRECT OR DIRECT QUESTIONS

I. Questions Whose Interpretation is Indifferent 110
II. Questions Which are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect than as Direct
1. Questions More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect, than as Direct and Not Quoted 111
2. Questions More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect, than as Directly Quoted 115

CHAPTER II. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: INDIRECT QUESTIONS OR EXCLAMATIONS

I. Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent 118
II. Clauses Which are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Exclamations 118

CHAPTER III. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: INDIRECT QUESTIONS OR RELATIVE CLAUSES

I. Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent 125
II. Clauses Which are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Relative Clauses 127

CHAPTER IV. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: INDIRECT QUESTIONS OR CONDITIONS

I. Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent 139
II. Clauses Which are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Conditions 139

CHAPTER V. INDETERMINATE EXAMPLES: MISCELLANEOUS 142

CHAPTER VI. CLAUSES WHICH, IF THE SOLE OR BEST MANUSCRIPT TRADITION IS FOLLOWED, ARE CERTAINLY INDICATIVE INDIRECT QUESTIONS 144

CHAPTER VII. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSION 158

GENERAL CONCLUSION

I. The Occurrence of Instances of the Indicative Indirect Question 158
II. Unjustifiability of Emendation and Forced Interpretation 158
III. Comparative Frequency of the Construction in Conversational and Inelegant Styles 160
IV. Outline of the History of the Construction 164
V. Comparative Frequency of the Construction in Early and in Late Latin 165

VI. The Construction Seldom Used as an Archaism 166
VII. The Construction Not a Grecism 167
VIII. The Influence of Meter 168
IX. Avoidance of Ambiguity, by the Use of the Indicative 169
X. The Subjunctive the More Usual Mood in the Indirect Question of Fact 169
XI. Limitations of the Use of the Indicative 170
XII. Parallel Use of Indicative and Subjunctive 171
XIII. Application of the Results of this Paper to the Study of the Romance Languages 173
XIV. Application of the Results of this Paper to the Study of Latin 175

APPENDIX I

Additional Remarks on the Mood Use in Indirect Questions in Late Latin 176

APPENDIX II

Supplementary List of Doubtful Passages, in Most of Which the Evidence Favors the Subjunctive Reading 182

Manifestly Wrong Examples of the Indicative Indirect Question 190

APPENDIX III

Relative (Quis) Quid

I. Introductory 191
II. Evidence for the Use of (Quis) Quid, in the Sense of (Quisquis) Quicquid 193
III. Evidence for the Use of (Quis) Quid in the Sense of (Qui) Quod 196
IV. Conclusion 199

APPENDIX IV

The Interrogative Use of "Si" 201

INDEX LOCORUM 205

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Latin Authors

The Latin authors referred to in this study, exclusive of the appendices, and the editions chiefly used are mentioned here.

*Ad Herennium:

F. Marx. Leipzig, 1894.

C. F. W. Müller. Leipzig, 1893.

*Aetheria (or Silvia):

E. A. Bechtel. Chicago, 1902.

Ammianus Marcellinus:

C. U. Clark, Vol. I, Libri 14-25. Berlin, 1910.

*Apuleius:

R. Helm and P. Thomas. Leipzig, 1905-10.

*Asconius:

A. Kiessling and R. Schoell. Berlin, 1875.

A. C. Clark. Oxford, 1907.

Augustine:

B. Dombart, De Civitate Dei, ed. 2. Leipzig, 1877-92.

P. Knöll, Confessiones. Leipzig, 1898.

J. P. Migne, Patrologia Latina, vols. 32-47.

*Caesar:

B. Kübler, Editio Maior. Leipzig, 1893-97.

H. Meusel, Lexicon Caesarianum. Berlin, 1887.

*Cato:

H. Keil, De Agri Cultura. Leipzig, 1884.

H. Jordan, Praeter Librum de Re Rustica Quae Extant. Leipzig, 1860.

*Catullus:

R. Ellis. Oxford, 1904.

Celsus:

C. Daremberg. Leipzig, 1891.

*Cicero:

C. F. W. Müller. Leipzig, 1893-98.

J. G. Baiter and C. L. Kayser. Leipzig, 1860-69.

C. Halm and J. G. Baiter, ex Recensione Orelli. Zurich, 1845-61.

J. A. Ernest. London, 1819.

A. C. Clark, Orationes pro P. Quinctio, pro L. Flacco, etc. Oxford, 1909.

R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, The Correspondence of Cicero. Dublin, 1885-99.

*The asterisk indicates that the author or the work that is starred has been read completely through, for the purposes of this study.

L. Mendelssohn, Epistularum Libri Sedecim. Leipzig, 1893.
L. C. Purser, Ad Atticum. Oxford, 1903.
F. Hofmann and G. Andresen, Ausgewählte Briefe, ed. 2. Berlin, 1885.
A. S. Wilkins, Rhetorical Works. Oxford, 1901-03.

CLAUDIANUS MAMERTIUS:
A. Engelbrecht. Vienna, 1885.

*COLUMELLA:
J. G. Schneider, Scriptores Rei Rusticae Veteres Latini. Leipzig, 1794-97.

COMMODIAN:
E. Ludwig. Leipzig, 1877-78.

*CORIPPUS:
M. Petschenig, *Berliner Studien für klassische Philologie* IV (1886).

*ENNIUS:
J. Vahlen. Leipzig, 1903.

ENNODIUS:
A. Dubois, La Latinité d' Ennodius. Paris, 1903.

FESTUS:
W. M. Lindsay. Leipzig, 1913.

FRONTO:
S. A. Naber, M. Cornelii Frontonis et M. Aurelii Imperatoris Epistulae. Leipzig, 1867.

GELLIUS:
C. Hosius, Volumen Prius (Libri 1-10). Leipzig, 1903.
M. Hertz. Berlin, 1883.

*GREGORY OF TOURS:
W. Arndt and B. Krusch, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Hanover, 1885.

*HERMERUS, MULOMEDICINA CHIRONIS:
E. Oder. Leipzig, 1901.

*HORACE:
F. Vollmer. Leipzig, 1907.

Sermones
A. Palmer, ed. 4. London, 1891.
P. Lejay. Paris, 1911.
L. Müller. Vienna, 1891.

Epistulae
P. Lejay, in edition of Horace by F. Plessis and P. Lejay. Paris, 1912.

JEROME:
J. P. Migne, vols. 22-29.

*JUVENAL:
A. E. Housman. London, 1905.

*LIVY:
W. Weissenborn. Leipzig, 1894.
R. S. Conway and C. F. Walters, Books 1-5. Oxford, 1914.

*LUCAN:
C. Hosius. Leipzig, 1905.

*Lucilius:
F. Marx. Leipzig, 1904-05.
*Lucilius (?), Aetna:
S. Sudhaus. Leipzig, 1898.
R. Ellis, in Postgate, Corpus Poetarum Latinorum Fasc. III. London, 1900.
H. A. J. Munro. Cambridge, 1867.
*Lucretius:
H. A. J. Munro. London, 1900.
*Lygdamus:
In Tibullus, *q.v.*
Manilius:
T. Breiter. Leipzig, 1908.
J. van Wageningen. Leipzig, 1915.
H. W. Garrod, Liber II. Oxford, 1911.
*Martial:
L. Friedländer. Leipzig, 1886.
W. M. Lindsay. Oxford, 1902.
*Naevius (no examples):
L. Müller, Enni Carminum Reliquiae. Accedunt Cn. Naevi belli Poenici quae supersunt. St. Petersburg, 1884.
Nepos:
E. O. Winstedt. Oxford, 1904.
*Ovid:
M. Haupt, O. Korn, and R. Ehwald, Metamorphoses, ed. 3. Berlin, 1898.
H. Magnus, Metamorphoses, ed. 1 and 2. Gotha, 1886-1903; also ed. Berlin, 1914.
R. Ehwald, Vol. I, Amores, Epist., Medic. Fac. Fem., Ars Am., Rem. Am., Leipzig, 1888; Vol. II, Metamorphoses, Editio Maior., Leipzig, 1915.
P. Brandt, Amores. Leipzig, 1911. Ars Amatoria. Leipzig, 1902.
A. Palmer, Heroides. Oxford, 1898.
O. Güthling, Fasti, Tristia, Ibis, Ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta. Prague, 1884.
R. Merkel, Tristia, Ibis, Ex Ponto, Fasti. Leipzig, 1897.
S. G. Owen, Tristia, Ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragm. Oxford, 1915.
R. Ellis, Ibis. Oxford, 1881.
*Persius:
O. Jahn, Persii, Iuvenalis, Sulpiciae Saturae. Berlin, 1910.
*Petronius:
F. Bücheler, Saturae et Liber Priapeorum. Berlin, 1862.
F. Bücheler—W. Heraeus. Berlin, 1912.
L. Friedländer, Cena Trimalchionis. Leipzig, 1891.
*Plautus:
F. Ritschl, G. Loewe, G. Goetz, F. Schoell. Leipzig, 1878-94.
G. Goetz—F. Schoell. Leipzig, 1904-09.
F. Leo. Berlin, 1895-96.
W. M. Lindsay. Oxford, 1903.

J. L. Ussing. Hafnia, 1875-86.
C. H. Weise. Quedlenburg and Leipzig, 1848; index at end of Vol. II.
E. P. Morris, Pseudolus. Boston, 1895.
E. A. Sonnenschein, Rudens. Oxford, 1891.
E. A. Sonnenschein, Mostellaria. Oxford, 1907.
A. R. S. Hallidie, Captivi. London, 1891.
E. P. Morris, Captivi and Trinummus. Boston, 1898.

PLINY THE ELDER:
L. Janus, Vol. I. Leipzig, 1870.

*PLINY THE YOUNGER:
C. F. W. Müller. Leipzig, 1903.
R. C. Kukula. Leipzig, 1908; 2d ed. 1912.

PRISCIAN:
H. Keil, Grammatici Latini, Vols. II and III. Leipzig, 1855-59.

*PROPERTIUS:
C. Hosius. Leipzig, 1911.
J. S. Phillimore. Oxford, 1901.
J. P. Postgate, Select Elegies of Propertius. London, 1897.

*QUINTILIAN, INSTITUTIO ORATORIA:
L. Radermacher, Part I (Books I-VI). Leipzig, 1907.
F. Meister (XII Books). Leipzig, 1886-87.

RUTILIUS LUPUS:
In Halm, Rhetores Latini Minores, *q. v.*

*SALLUST:
R. Dietsch. Leipzig, 1859.

*SENECA THE ELDER:
F. Haase. Leipzig, 1902.

*SENECA THE YOUNGER:
C. R. Fickert, Epistulae Morales, Leipzig, 1842; De Beneficiis, De Clementia, De Ira, Leipzig, 1843.
F. Haase, Opera quae Supersunt, Leipzig, 1887-92; Opera quae Supersunt Supplementum, Leipzig, 1902.
J. Vahlen, Dialogi. Ulm, 1884.
C. Hosius, De Beneficiis and De Clementia. Leipzig, 1914.
A. Gercke, Naturales Quaestiones. Leipzig, 1907.
R. Peiper and G. Richter, Tragoediae. Leipzig, 1902.
F. Leo, Tragoediae. Berlin, 1878.

*SILIUS ITALICUS:
L. Bauer. Leipzig, 1890.

*STATIUS:
A. Klotz, Leipzig: Silvae, 1900; Achilleis, 1902; Thebais, 1908.

SULPICIUS SEVERUS
H. Goelzer, Grammaticae in Sulpicium Severum Observationes. Paris, 1883.

TACITUS:
C. D. Fisher, Annales, Oxford, 1906; Historiae, Oxford, 1910.
H. Furneaux, Germania. Oxford, 1894.

*Terence:
R. Y. Tyrrell. Oxford, 1902.
A. Fleckeisen. Leipzig, 1895.
K. Dziatzko—E. Hauler, Phormio. Leipzig, 1898.
H. C. Elmer, Phormio. Boston, 1895 and 1916.
G. Laing, Phormio. Chicago, 1908.
P. Thomas, Hecyra. Paris, 1887.
Tertullian:
F. Oehler. Leipzig, 1853-54.
*Tiberianus:
E. Baehrens, Unedierte lateinische Gedichte. Leipzig, 1877.
*Tibullus:
J. P. Postgate. Oxford, 1914.
Valerius Flaccus:
O. Kramer. Leipzig, 1913.
Valerius Maximus:
C. Kempf, ed. 2. Leipzig, 1888.
C. B. Hase. Paris, 1822-23.
*Varro:
H. Keil, Res Rusticae. Leipzig, 1884.
G. Goetz, Res Rusticae. Leipzig, 1912.
G. Goetz and F. Schoell, De Lingua Latina. Leipzig, 1910.
A. Riese, Saturae Menippeae. Leipzig, 1865.
*Vegetius:
J. G. Schneider. Leipzig, 1797.
E. Lommatzsch. Leipzig, 1903.
*Virgil:
O. Güthling. Leipzig, 1894-1907.
F. A. Hirtzel. Oxford, 1900.
A. Sidgwick. Cambridge, 1905; index at end of Vol. II.
E. Norden, Aeneid, Buch VI. Leipzig, 1903.
F. Leo. Culex, Accedit Copa Elegia. Berlin, 1891.
T. Ladewig, C. Schaper, and P. Deuticke, erstes Bändchen, Bukolika und Georgika, neunte Auflage, bearbeitet von P. Jahn. Berlin, 1915.
Vitruvius:
F. Krohn. Leipzig, 1912.

II. Modern Collections

*Bruns, C. G. and Gradenwitz, O.
Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui, Pars Prior. Tübingen, 1909.
*Buecheler, F.
Carmina Latina Epigraphica, Leipzig, 1895-97; in Buecheler-Riese, Anthologia Latina.
Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Consilio et Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae. Berlin, 1893-99.

Halm, K.
Rhetores Latini Minores. Leipzig, 1863.
Huebner, E.
Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae. Berlin, 1871.
*Meyer, H.
Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta. Zurich, 1842.
Migne, J. P.
Patrologia Latina. Paris, 1878-90.
Peter, H.
*Veterum Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae, Vol. I. Leipzig, 1870.
Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae, Vol. I. Leipzig, 1914.
*Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Leipzig, 1884.
Ribbeck, O.
Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta. Leipzig, 1871-73.

III. Modern Books, Articles, and Reviews

Only the works that have been chiefly used are cited here. Some additional works are listed in Appendix I.

Appel, E.
Beiträge zur Erklärung des Corippus. Munich, 1904.
Baehrens, W. A.
Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax, *Philologus Supplementband* XII (1912) 235-556.
Becker, E.
De Syntaxi Interrogationum Obliquarum apud Priscos Scriptores Latinos, in Studemund, *Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins*, Vol. I, pp. 113-314. Berlin, 1873.
Bennett, C. E.
Syntax of Early Latin, Vol. I, The Verb. Boston, 1910.
Bonnet, M.
Le latin de Grégoire de Tours. Paris, 1890.
Brugmann, K.
Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Strassburg, 1904.
Buck, C. D.
A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian. Boston, 1904 (German translation, Heidelberg, 1905).
Deecke, G.
De Usu Pronominis Relativi apud Poetas Veteres Latinos Quaestiones Syntacticae. Göttingen, 1907.
Delbrück, B.
Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen, Part III. (Brugmann-Delbrück, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, Vol. V). Strassburg, 1900.
Draeger, A.
Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache, Vol. II. Leipzig, 1881.

Gaffiot, F.

Quelques cas d' interrogation indirecte, *Revue de philologie* XXVIII (1904) 49-55.

Ecqui fuerit *si* particulae in interrogando latine usus. Paris, 1904.

Le prétendu emploi de *si* interrogatif en latin, *Revue de philologie* XXXII (1908) 47-58.

Pour le vrai latin. Paris, 1909.

(Quis) Quid relatif, *Revue de philologie* XXXIV (1910) 57-67.

Gutsche, W. O.

De Interrogationibus Obliquis apud Ciceronem Observationes Selectae. Halle, 1885.

Hale, W. G.

The Cum-Constructions: their History and Functions, *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology* I. Ithaca, N. Y., 1887 (German translation by A. Neitzert. Leipzig, 1891).

A Century of Metaphysical Syntax, *Congress of Arts and Science, Universal Exposition*, Vol. III, pp. 191-202. St. Louis, 1904.

Hale, W. G. and Buck, C. D.

Latin Grammar. Boston, 1903.

Kroll, W.

Der lateinische Relativsatz, *Glotta* III (1910-12) pp. 1-18.

Kühner, R.

Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache, Zweiter Band, Satzlehre, neubearbeitet von C. Stegmann. Hanover, 1914.

Langen, P.

Commentationes Cornificianae, *Philologus* XXXVII (1877) pp. 385-414.

Lindsay, W. M.

Syntax of Plautus. Oxford, 1907.

Lindskog, C.

De Enuntiatis apud Plautum et Terentium Condicionalibus. Lund, 1895.

Quaestiones de Parataxi et Hypotaxi apud Priscos Latinos. Lund, 1896.

Marx, F.

Die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* XXIII (1909) pp. 434-448.

Meyer-Lübke, W.

Grammaire des langues romanes, traduction française par Doutrepont; tome 3, syntaxe. Paris, 1900.

Die vorromanischen Volkssprachen, in Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* Vol. I. Strassburg, 1888.

Morris, E. P.

On the Sentence Question in Plautus and Terence, *The American Journal of Philology* X (1889) pp. 397-436 and XI (1890) pp. 16 ff. and 145 ff.

Owen, E. T.

Interrogative Thought and the Means of its Expression, *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, XIV. Madison, Wis., 1903, pp. 345-470.

Paetzolt, F.
De Latini Pronominis Relativi Syntaxi Prisca. Breslau, 1873.
Pirson, J.
La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule. Brussells, 1901.
Praun, J.
Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitruvs. Bamburg, 1885.
Prescott, H. W.
Review of Helm's edition of Apuleius, Metamorphoses, *Classical Philology* X (1915) 358.
Paul, H.
Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte, ed. 3. Halle, 1898.
Rebling, O.
Versuch einer Charakteristik der römischen Umgangssprache. Kiel, 1873.
Riemann, O.
La langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live. Paris, 1885.
Riemann, O., and Goelzer, H.
Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin. Paris, 1897.
Schmalz, J. H.
Lateinische Syntax, in Stolz-Schmalz, Lateinische Grammatik, ed. 4. Munich, 1910.
Skutsch, F.
Review of Gaffiot, Pour le vrai latin, *Glotta* III (1912) 366.
Ströbel, E.
Tulliana. Munich, 1908.
Uhlmann, W.
De Sexti Properti Genere Dicendi. Münster, 1909.
Wölfflin, E.
Bemerkungen über das Vulgärlatein, *Philologus* XXXIV (1876) 137-165.
Wolff, O.
De Enuntiatis Interrogativis apud Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium. Halle, 1883.

INTRODUCTION

I. Review of Various Studies and Opinions concerning the Indicative Indirect Question

The subject of the use in Latin of the indicative indirect question is one which has been much discussed but upon which there is still no general agreement. The study of the problem has been hampered by various preconceived ideas, which once prevailed, and still have influence, in the field of syntax.

According to a theory which originated in a careless naming of one of the moods by the Greek grammarians, and the translating of the resulting Greek name into Latin, the subjunctive is the mood of dependence.[1] This theory has led some scholars to maintain that all dependent questions should be in the subjunctive, and that apparent examples of such questions with the indicative are not really dependent questions, but are to be otherwise interpreted.[2] This theory has led, likewise, to the explanation of the use of the indicative mood in questions apparently indirect, as due to the tendency of popular speech to disregard the relationships of clauses.[3]

According to another theory, the indicative is the mood of objective reality, while the subjunctive is the mood of thought.[4] Therefore, the

[1] See Hale, "A Century of Metaphysical Syntax," *Congress of Arts and Science, Universal Exposition* (St. Louis, 1904), Vol. III, 191 ff., especially 195 and 197. For the refutation of this theory, cf. Hale, *The Cum-Constructions: their History and Functions* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1887), 3 ff.; German translation, 1 ff.

[2] Cf. p. xix, n. 9.

[3] Cf. Haase, *Ad Reisigium* n. 504: "In der Volkssprache, die nichts leichter vernachlaessigt, als die Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse der Saetze" (cited more fully, p. xviii, n. 5).

[4] For the history of this theory, and its connection with the one just mentioned, see Hale, *A Century of Metaphysical Syntax* 199, and "The Heritage of Unreason in Syntactical Method," *Proceedings of the Classical Association (of England and Wales)* V (1907), 53 ff. For the refutation of the theory that the subjunctive is the mood of thought, cf. Hale, *Cum-Constructions*, 5 ff.; German translation, 3 ff.

indicative indirect question has been held to express something as certain, or as a fact, and the subjunctive to express a mere thought.[5]

Closely connected with these theories about the meanings of the moods, is the notion that Latin syntax, and particularly that of the Ciceronian age, is something fixed and stereotyped.[6] If the subjunctive was used in a given construction, some grammarians think, it had to be used in *all* examples of this construction. That Latin, and particularly the Latin of Cicero's age, might admit of either the subjunctive or the indicative in an identical use, is a thought that is repugnant to these scholars. Especially, that the same writer would employ now the one mood and now the other without any distinction in meaning, is an idea to which some minds, whether consciously or unconsciously, are closed.[7]

[5] Cf. Weissenborn, *Syntax Latina* 327 (quoted by Becker, *op. cit. infra*, 116): "So werden auch im Lateinischen . . . nicht selten solche Nebensätze als gewisse im Indikativ dargestellt." Cf. also Lindemann (cited by Holtze, *op. cit. infra*, 112): "Tenendum tamen, indicativum in his formulis ubique habere aliquam confidentiae vel certae persuasionis notionem, ut non idem plane significent *scio quid velis* et *scio quid vis*"; and Paetzolt, *De Latini Pronominis Relativi Syntaxi Prisca* (Breslau, 1873), 26: "Ut quae rem complectantur factam vel vere extantem, in iis indicativus adhibeatur, coniunctivus ponatur in iis quae cogitati aliquid vel ficti contineant." Reisig, *Schol. Lat.* §329 (quoted with approval by Becker, 304) shows a combination of the theory that the subjunctive is the mood of thought with the theory that it is the mood of dependence: "Was aber hier [i.e., in interrogationibus obliquis] als ein subjektiver Gedanke dargestellt wird, kann auch in der Form der Objektivität gegeben werden, wo die Sache nicht mehr in der Abhängigkeit von dem Denken steht, sondern für sich der grammatischen Form nach hingestellt ist als etwas Objektives. Hier ist also selbst die grammatische Form eine unabhängige, und der Indikativ wird dann angewendet, wofern nicht zu dem Inhalt des Gedankens der Sinn der Möglichkeit kommen soll." A similar combination appears in Haase's remark, *Ad Reisigium* n. 504 (quoted with approval by Becker, 118): "Vielmehr haben ihn [i.e., diesen Sprachgebrauch] die Komiker wohl schon vorgefunden in der Volkssprache, die nichts leichter vernachlässigt, als die Abhängigkeitverhältnisse der Satze; die lebendige Anschauung des Faktischen und die Neigung der Phantasie sich auch das nicht Faktische als solches vorzustellen, veranlassen den Indikativ."

[6] Cf. Becker, *op. cit. infra*, 115: "Nam in his ipsis legibus variandi studio multa commutata sunt, donec ad *absolutam illam et certam loquendi rationem* perventum est, quam Ciceronis aetate valere constat" (the italics are mine). Cf. also Haase, *Ad Reisigium* n. 504 (quoted by Becker, 119): "In sorgfältiger Redegatting, wo die grammatischen Verbindungen so pedantisch wahrgenommen werden, wie es in der besten Zeit der Römer immer geschah."

[7] Cf., for example, Fuhrmann, "Der Indikativ in den sogenannten indirekten Fragesaetzen bei Plautus," *N. J.B. für Philologie u. Pädagogik*, *CV* (1872), 809-831,

A priori theories concerning the meanings of the moods and the belief in a stereotyped Latin syntax have combined to create a prejudiced attitude toward the indicative indirect question. Forced distinctions have been drawn between indirect questions with the subjunctive and apparent examples with the indicative;[8] apparent examples of indicative indirect questions have been interpreted as direct questions or as relative clauses;[9] the construction, being regarded as something foreign to Latin, has been said to be due to Greek influence;[10] and, finally, recourse has been had to emendation.[11]

Holtze's work, *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum usque ad Terentium* (Leipzig, 1861–62) may be cited in illustration of the prejudiced attitude toward the indicative indirect question. Holtze, Vol. II, p. 110, quotes with approval the remark of Haase, *Ad Reisigium*, pp. 597 ff., n. 504, to the effect that the indicative indirect question originated in the popular speech, "in quo enuntiationum unam ab altera pendere facile negligatur et quae e sola cogitatione suspensa sunt, saepissime

---

especially 810. Langen, "Commentationes Cornificianae," *Philologus*, XXXVII (1877), 405, emends the few cases of the indicative indirect question in the *Ad Herennium*, for the reason that the subjunctive indirect question is very frequent in that work. Similarly Draeger, *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1881), 467, would emend the comparatively few cases of the indicative indirect question in the prose works of the younger Seneca. Kroll, "Der lateinische Relativsatz," *Glotta*, III (1910-12), 6, thinks that indicative indirect questions in Cicero are rightly emended, "denn Cicero setzt aus übergrosser Gewissenhaftigkeit den Konjunktiv auch Ep. III, 10, 11."

[8] So Ramshorn, *Lateinische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1830), II. 712, explains the use of the indicative in Cic. Verr. Act. II, III 26, 64, Iam omnes intelligunt, cur universa provincia defensorem suae salutis eum quaesivit, on the ground that the indirect question expresses something as a fact: "wirklich gesucht hat."

[9] Hand, *Tursellinus* (Leipzig, 1829-45), I, 359 denies the use of the indicative in indirect questions and expresses the opinion that the apparent examples of this construction are to be explained as really being direct questions. For the interpretation of an apparent instance of an indirect question, as a relative clause, see the next paragraph.

[10] So by Reisig, *Schol. Lat.* §329 (quoted by Becker, p. 116). Cf. also Kühnast, *Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax* (Berlin, 1872), 234: "Ein entschiedener Gräcismus, und ohne Parallele vor Livius ausser in der Komödie . . . ist der Indikativ in der indirekten Frage."

[11] Cf. p. xviii, n. 7. The emendation of indicative indirect questions began at least as early as the time of Lambinus. Cf. Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax* (Munich, 1910), 516.

tamquam facta animo praeponantur," and says that some examples can be explained as direct questions, some as exclamations, and some as relative clauses. He does not, to be sure, state that *all* apparent examples of the indicative indirect question are to be explained away. However, he gives a forced interpretation when he remarks, p. 110: "Sic relativum esse videtur Cato R. R. c. 6: Vineam quo in agro conseri oportet, sic observato, h. e. in eo agro, in quo (ut iam scies), vinea conserenda est, haec observato."

The most comprehensive study of our subject which has yet appeared, Becker's *De Syntaxi Interrogationum Obliquarum apud Priscos Scriptores Latinos*, in Studemund, *Studien* I, (Berlin, 1873), pp. 113-314, likewise shows the influence of preconceived ideas. The purpose which Becker set before himself was to discover the laws[12] which in early Latin governed the use of moods in indirect questions. This purpose was, of course, perfectly legitimate. Only, an investigator should determine laws by the inductive method, after an extensive and unprejudiced study of phenomena. This, it seems to me, Becker did not do. Setting out with the purpose of discovering laws, Becker makes generalizations which the facts do not warrant. See below, pp. xxi f.

Becker's conclusion concerning the use of the indicative mood in indirect questions in early Latin is as follows (p. 119): "Indicativus enim ubi in interrogationibus obliquis occurrit, profectus est aut ex laxo enuntiati primarii et secundarii conexu, aut ex inclinatione quadam pronominis interrogativi ad verbum enuntiati primarii aut denique ex ipsa enuntiati secundarii natura, ubi res de qua agitur ita omni dubitatione vacat, ut contra rationem grammaticam propter hanc praedicati condicionem indicativus positus sit." His indicative examples are classed in two main groups, the first group embodying the first of the three principles mentioned, and the second group the second and third principles.

[12] This is apparent throughout Becker's study. Cf., e.g., p. 116: "Certas enim leges in his modis adhibendis omnino non secutos esse priscos scriptores fere omnes sibi persuaserunt grammatici, qui hucusque hanc quaestionem tetigerunt: cui rei id praecipuo argumento est, quod non singula interrogationum genera distinxerunt, quae certis legibus aut indicativum aut coniunctivum praeberent, sed in singulis exemplis indicativum excusabant"; and p. 119: "Quamquam enim apparebit in universum scriptores priscos easdem leges in adhibendis modis secutos esse atque posteriores, et quamvis saepe difficile sit legum, quas in ponendo aut indicativo aut coniunctivo secuti sint scriptores prisci, certos constituere fines, tamen aliquot sunt interrogationum species in quibus certas leges in adhibendis his modis secuti esse videntur."

In the first group (pp. 120 ff.), the indicative mood is explained on the ground that the connection between the clauses in the sentence is loose. Becker says, p. 165: "Docuimus autem indicativum inde explicandum esse, quod duo enuntiata tam laxe cohaererent, ut utrumque fere per se stare videretur." Very many of the passages cited can, I agree with Becker, be well explained in such a way. Compare, e.g., Plaut. Bacch. 600: Dic mihi quis tu es (cited by Becker, p. 126). I should omit "fere" from the above quotation, and grant that the questions in Bacch. 600 and in many of Becker's examples may perfectly well be direct. However, I cannot follow Becker when he attempts to set up rigid laws for the use of the indicative and of the subjunctive. He is governed largely by the assumption that where the indicative is used, the subjunctive could not be, and vice versa. Thus, having found a large number of examples of the indicative in questions accompanied by verbs in the imperative mood, he concludes that the use of the indicative in such questions is a law of early Latin, and emends the comparatively few examples that show the subjunctive (cf. his pp. 147 ff., and esp. 157ff.). Again, having set up the rule (p. 165), that when the connection between a question and its introductory verb is close, the question must be in the subjunctive mood, Becker emends the examples which contradict the rule. Thus he emends the indicative in questions that show "artificial prolepsis"[13] (pp. 168 ff.). He emends, likewise, the instances of the use of the indicative in clauses "in quibus is qui loquitur non alterum quendam interrogat sed aut ex aliquo, quem tamen non adloquitur, postea se aliquid quaesiturum esse praedicat aut hoc tantum indicat se id agere, quomodo de aliqua re certior fieri possit" (cf. his pp. 188 and 195). Similarly, he emends (p. 200) those examples which contradict his rule (p. 198) that "coniunctivus in eis interrogationibus flagitatur, ubi alium quendam id quod enuntiato secundario exprimitur rogitantem vel sciscitantem induco." For other passages which Becker emends because they do not comply with his laws, cf. his pp. 206, 219, 228, 240, 244-5, 262.[14]

[13] For "artificial prolepsis," see this study, p. 87, n. 1.

[14] Becker has been criticized by various scholars for emending too freely: by Ussing (ed. Plautus, Hafnia, 1875-86), on Amph., Prologue 17; by Lindskog, *Quaestiones de Parataxi et Hypotaxi apud Priscos Latinos* (Lund, 1896), 92; by Antoine, "De la parataxe et de l'hypotaxe dans la langue latine," *Revue des études anciennes*, I (1899), 255 ff.; by Kroll, *Der lateinische Relativsatz*, 5, n. 1.

In Becker's second group of examples the indicative mood is explained on the twofold ground that the clauses are not interrogative but relative, and that they express certainty or objective reality (pp. 303 ff.). As regards the explanation of apparent examples of the indicative indirect question on the ground that they are relative clauses, I agree with Becker that this is in very many cases possible. An instance is Plaut. Amph. 460: Ibo ad portum atque haec uti sunt facta ero dicam meo (cf. Becker, p. 306). Sometimes, however, Becker's use of this explanation results in forced interpretations. This is true, for example, in the case of Plaut. Rud. 965: Et qui invenit hominem novi et *dominus qui nunc est* scio; and the similar examples in Rud. 958 and 1297 (Becker, p. 310). It is true also of Ter. Hec. 472 (p. 309): Idque si nunc memorare hic velim, Quam fideli animo et benigno in illam et clementi fui, Vere possum.

The theory that the indicative is the mood of objectivity or certainty, and the subjunctive the mood of subjectivity or doubt, passed down to Becker from the metaphysical speculations of earlier scholars. Cf. p. xvii n. 4. This theory has been refuted, at least for the subjunctive mood, by Hale, *Cum-Constructions*, pp. 5 ff. (German translation, 3 ff.). The distinction which Becker draws, p. 304, is quite fanciful: "Quod discrimen intercedat inter enuntiata illa, quae indicativum praebeant, et ea, quae coniunctivum, ex huiusmodi exemplis optime intellegitur, ut Amph. 1129, Simul hanc rem, ut factast, eloquar, et Trin. 236, Omnium primum Amoris artis eloquar, quemadmodum se expediant. In priore enim versu is qui loquitur indicativo ostendit se rem ita ut sit, explicaturum esse, neque suam ipsius opinionem admiscentem neque rem cum aliis condicionibus mente conectentem; in posteriore vero enuntiato coniunctivo exprimitur rem non simpliciter narrari, sed ita exponi, ut eam esse is qui loquitur ex sua ipsius sententia sibi persuaserit: profitetur igitur, quemadmodum amoris artes se expediant, ita se elocuturum esse, ut ipse illas sese expedire compertum habeat, neque negat fieri posse ut alia quoque ratione illae sese expediant." However, as Becker does not make much use of the theory of objectivity, but employs it only in connection with the explanation of clauses as relative, it is not worth while to dwell upon this point.

Though Becker's aim is the establishment of rules for the use of the indicative and of the subjunctive in the examples—real or apparent—of the indirect question, yet he concedes to the early writers of Latin some degree of freedom. Thus he says, pp. 313 ff.: "In hac quaestione videre

licet . . . certum quidem sensum vel instinctum eos secutos esse in oratione concinnanda, at tamen ab experimento omnia nata esse neque deesse locos, in quibus ingeniosae licentiae nimis indulserint." Still, immediately after making this concession, Becker concludes his study with the following statement: "Id certe his plagulis effecisse mihi videor, ut in posterum ne ad taedium usque repeteretur decantata illa modorum confusio, qua tum coniunctivus tum indicativus mirabili neglegentia effudisse dicebantur prisci scriptores."

It does not seem to me that Becker's conclusion is sound. It is only by the help of forced interpretations and of a considerable amount of emendation that he establishes his distinctions between the indicative and the subjunctive in indirect questions. A conclusion which involves such expedients is of questionable validity.

Becker has exerted a powerful influence upon Latin grammars and syntactical studies, and upon editions of Latin authors. Draeger's treatment of the indirect question in early Latin is a summary of Becker's article.[15] Kuehner, likewise, closely follows Becker,[16] and the Kuehner-Stegmann grammar shows his influence.[17] Schmalz expresses the ideas of Becker and his predecessors, *Lateinische Syntax*, p. 516: "Im Altlateinischen hat sich der Indikativ in der indirekten Frage noch vielfach erhalten, d.h. die Stellung des Fragesatzes zum Hauptsatze ist eine ziemlich selbstaendige . . ."; and again, "Selbstverstaendlich ist der Konjunktiv, wo der Inhalt des Gefragten noch zweifelhaft und ungewiss ist, z. B. renuntiet mihi, velitne an non, oder wo bloss über eine Frage gesprochen wird, z. B. Cato Agr. I Praedium quod primum siet, si me rogabis, sic dicam, oder wo der Fragesatz infolge einer Prolepsis seines Subjekts—welche oft bei den Komikern vorkommt—die wesentliche und notwendige Ergänzung des Hauptsatzes bildet, z. B. Plaut. Pers. 635 Patriam te rogo quae sit tua." The explanation of apparent instances of indicative indirect questions as being really independent is given by Gildersleeve-Lodge[18] and Lane.[19] Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford,

[15] *Historische Syntax* (Leipzig, 1881), II, 460 ff., §§463 ff.

[16] *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Hanover, 1879), II, 989 ff., esp. 990 n.

[17] *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Hanover, 1914), II, 2, 488 ff., §§227 ff.

[18] *Latin Grammar* (New York, 1894), §467 n.

[19] *Latin Grammar* (New York, 1898), §1787.

1907), § 281, p. 66, where he refers to Becker's article, makes the statement that parataxis is in evidence "most of all in *indirect* questions, which in Plautus are as often *direct* (with indicative) as *indirect* (with subjunctive)." (The italics are mine.)

The influence of the theories of Becker and his predecessors upon editions of Latin authors is apparent not only from explicit references to Becker like the one of Sonnenschein on Rudens 385 (Oxford, 1891), but also from the common explanation that the indicative in indirect questions is due to parataxis.[20] This influence is observable, also, in the attempt to turn indirect questions into relative clauses by changing *quid* to *quod*.[21]

Becker concerned himself only with early Latin. However, he and his predecessors have strongly influenced the study of the Latin of later periods. Draeger, e.g., in his paragraphs upon the indicative indirect question in Ciceronian and early imperial Latin, employs the same methods as Becker.[22] The metaphysical theory that the subjunctive and indicative express, respectively, subjectivity and objectivity, is presumed in Postgate's note on Propertius I 2, 9 (ed. London, 1897): "Some manuscripts have *summittit*. If right, the change of mood, *summittit* . . . *veniant*, is not due to any essential difference of meaning, but is a relic of a time when, as in Old Latin, the distinction between facts regarded as facts and as conceptions had not been evolved." The explanation that the indicative is due to parataxis is found in Appel, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Corippus* (Munich, 1904), pp. 54 ff.: "Den auf die volkstümliche Bevorzugung des parataktischen Satzverhältnisses sich gründenden Indikativ in abhängigen Fragesätzen, der durch alle Zeitalter der römischen Volkssprache herrscht . . . bietet Corippus oft." Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris, 1890), p. 676, remarks: "Il est probable que la véritable raison de l'indicatif c'est qu'on oublie que ces phrases sont des interrogations. On les confond avec les propositions relatives, conditionnelles, etc."

[20] Cf. Morris' edition of the Captivi and Trinummus (Boston 1898), Introduction, §27: "These [i.e. indirect questions] are still largely in the paratactic stage." Cf. also Morris on Pseud. 262 (Boston, 1895); Sonnenschein on Most. 149 (Oxford, 1907); Elmer on Terence Phorm. 358 (Boston, 1895).

[21] Cf. Tyrrell on Adel. 996 (ed. Terence; Oxford, 1902).

[22] *Op. cit.*, II, 473 ff., §§464 ff.

It is a significant fact, that the editors who nominally adopt the explanation of indicative questions as paratactic, almost without exception show by their punctuation that they actually feel many of these questions to be hypotactic. Cf. the passages cited, p. xxiv, n. 20, from Morris' edition of the *Pseudolus* and Sonnenschein's of the *Mostellaria*. Indeed Becker himself punctuates most of the examples in his first group, not with interrogation-points, but with periods. See his pages 125 ff.[23]

Further, the acceptance of Becker's theories is often qualified by statements which really contradict those theories. So Sonnenschein, on Plaut. Most. 149, remarks that sometimes "indicative and subjunctive stand side by side without any clear logical distinction." Similarly Praun, *Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitruvs* (Bamburg, 1885), p. 71, after explaining the use of the indicative in indirect questions on the ground that "statt des Frageverhaeltnisses die relative Beziehung betont wird oder . . . der Gedanke als objektiv wahr hingestellt ist," adds immediately: "Wie geringfügig der Unterschied ist geht daraus hervor, dass nach dem gleichen übergeordneten Verbum unter denselben Verhältnissen bald der Indikativ, bald der Konjunktiv folgt, ja dass sogar oft in einer Periode der Modus wechselt." The clash between theory and feeling is manifest also from the expression, "indicative questions *apparently* indirect" (cf. Lane, § 1787; Elmer, on Ter. Phorm. 358), and from the statement in Kühner-Stegmann, II, § 227, 6a: "Die alte Sprache neigt hier (i.e., after *qui*, *ut*, *quomodo*, *quamobrem*, *quam*, etc.) zu relativer Auffassung und setzt demnach den Indikativ, wenn auch fast ueberall ursprünglich eine indirekte Frage zugrunde liegt und vielfach trotz des Indikativs *eine relative Auffassung geradezu unmöglich ist.* (The italics in both citations are mine.)

There are, and there have been in the past, a considerable number of scholars who frankly accept the indicative indirect question in Latin as

[23] To be sure, Becker is saved from actual self-contradiction by the fact that he regards the clauses of his first group, not as quite independent, but as "fere" independent (Becker p. 165; cf. my p. xxi). Similarly Elmer, on Ter. Phorm. 358, explains the indicative on the ground that the question is "not far removed from parataxis." Elmer, quite explicitly, and Becker, by implication, assume three stages: "Vide! Avaritia quid facit!"; "Vide avaritia quid facit!"; "Vide avaritia quid faciat!" However, neither of these scholars undertakes to explain just what distinction in feeling there is between the second and the third stages, or—to put the matter a little differently—at what degree of "removal from parataxis" the subjunctive mood displaces the indicative.

an alternative construction to the subjunctive indirect question of fact. So Otto Schulz, *Ausführliche lateinische Grammatik* (Halle, 1825) p. 480, says: "Es giebt allerdings Beispiele, wo auf ein Fragewort mit welchem eine indirekte Frage eingeleitet wird, der Indikativ folgt."

Usually the acceptance of the indicative indirect question is a qualified acceptance. Thus J. N. Madvig, *Lateinische Sprachlehre für Schulen* (Braunschweig, 1844), remarks, § 356, n. 3: "Bei den ältesten Dichtern (Plautus und Terenz) steht bisweilen ein abhängiger Fragesatz im Indikativ . . . , bei den spätern (Horaz, Vergil) ist dieses selten, in Prosa ganz ungebräuchlich."[24] O. Wolff, *De Enuntiatis Interrogativis apud Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium* (Halle, 1883), p. 39, accepts the use of the indicative mood in indirect questions in poetry. He says: "Quam tenue sit ac paene nullum inter coniunctivum et indicativum discrimen, luculentum exemplum praebet Prop. III 5, 27 ff. [cited, p. 17], ubi agnoscemus, quam libere versatus sit in modorum commutatione. . . . Omnem operam quamquam dederam ut invenirem, quibus condicionibus indicativus, quibus coniunctivus positus videretur, tamen oleum et operam me perdidisse intellegere coactus sum, quod ad certam regulam utriusque modi usus redigi nullo pacto potest."

Riemann–Goelzer, *Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin* (Paris, 1897), § 407, remarque I, acknowledges the use of the indicative mood in indirect questions "dans la langue vulgaire et dans la langue poétique," but calls it an "*incorrection.*" Somewhat similar in tone is the comment of Allen and Greenough on Ovid, Met. X 637 (ed. Boston, 1890): "The indicative in an indirect question is common in early Latin but is almost inexcusable in Ovid."

Hallidie, Laing, and Sonnenschein acknowledge the use of the indicative indirect question in early Latin. Hallidie comments on Plaut. Capt. 207 (London, 1891): "The use of the indicative in dependent questions is not uncommon in Plautus. Setting aside those passages in which the indicative can be explained by taking the clause as an independent question or exclamation . . . there yet remain many instances in which the indicative is used although the clause is certainly dependent." Laing comments on Ter. Phorm. 358

[24] Becker, *op. cit.*, 116, quotes with disapproval this part of Madvig's discussion. He remarks, 117 ff.: "Apparet . . . viros doctos de modis in interrogationibus obliquis adhibendis certas leges apud priscos scriptores nondum agnovisse."

(Chicago, 1908): "The indicative is frequently used in indirect questions in early Latin." E. A. Sonnenschein, *A New Latin Grammar* (Oxford, 1912) remarks, p. 172, n. 2: "The use of the subjunctive in dependent questions as to a matter of fact . . . did not become a rule of Latin syntax till the time of Cicero, though it is often found in Old Latin."

Appel, *op. cit.*, p. 55, n. 1, calls attention to the frequency of the indicative indirect question in late Latin.

The Hale-Buck Latin Grammar (Boston, 1903) states, § 537 g: "The original indicative is still sometimes found in indirect questions . . . in poetry (especially in early Latin), and in late colloquial prose." Examples are cited from Plaut. Aul. 174 and Virg. Aen. VI 779.

Marx, in his edition of *Ad Herennium* (Leipzig, 1894), retains the indicative indirect questions "contra grammaticorum praecepta" (p. 176), and Schmalz, in spite of his acceptance of some of Becker's theories (cf. above, p. xxiii), commends Marx and expresses the opinion that "in all den Schriften auch der klassischen Zeit, welche der Volkssprache nahe stehen, der Indikativ der Ueberlieferung vielfach zu erhalten ist" (p. 516). Similarly Lejay, on Horace, Ep. I 7, 39 (Paris, 1912), comments that the use of the indicative mood in an indirect question is "un trait de la langue familière."

Cf. further, for statements, variously qualified, of the occurrence of the indicative mood in indirect questions in Latin, Riemann, *La langue et la grammaire de Tite Live* (Paris, 1885), p. 301, n. 3; Antoine, *Syntaxe de la langue latine* (Paris, 1885), § 243, 3; Allen and Greenough, *Latin Grammar* (Boston, 1899), § 334 d; Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin* (Boston, 1910), I pp. 120 ff.; Kroll, *Der lateinische Relativsatz*, p. 5.

In a series of articles, the earliest of which appeared in 1904, Felix Gaffiot has tried to disprove the existence of the indicative indirect question in pre-Augustan Latin. The attempt seems to me unsuccessful. References to Gaffiot are scattered throughout this study. See esp. pp. 81-84, 99 ff., 104 ff., and Appendices III and IV.

Among scholars who acknowledge the existence of the indicative indirect question, there is a difference of opinion as regards its origin. Becker, p. 119, rejects the theory of Greek influence (mentioned above, p. xix, n. 10) and agrees with Haase that the use of the indicative mood in indirect questions had its rise in the popular speech (cf. p. xviii, n. 5). That the construction is a colloquialism is held also by Rebling, *Versuch einer Charakteristik der römischen Umgangssprache* (Kiel, 1873), p. 7;

Riemann, *La langue et la grammaire de Tite Live*, p. 301, n. 3; Gérard, "Le latin vulgaire et le langage familierdans les satires de Perse," *Musée belge*, I (1897), p. 87, n. 7. The theory of Greek influence still has its adherents, though chiefly as an explanation of the occurrence of the construction in Augustan and later writers.[25] On the other hand, the use of the construction by these writers is sometimes considered an archaism.[26]

Some modern scholars, regarding language from the historical point of view, recognize that what really demands explanation is the use, not of the indicative mood, but of the subjunctive, in the indirect question of fact.[27] Cf. Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax* (Strassburg, 1900), vol. III, p. 287. The problem of the origin of this use of the subjunctive mood lies outside the scope of the present study.

II. Purpose and Method of this Study

The question of the use in Latin of indirect interrogative clauses in the indicative mood is one which is important for text-criticism, as well as for the formation of opinion upon the rigidity or flexibility of syntactical usage.[28] It seems desirable, then, because there is no general agreement upon the subject and because current theories lead to emendation and to forced interpretations, that the evidence be examined anew. This paper is an attempt at an objective study of the problem.

The method of procedure was as follows. First, most of the Latin works which were written before the end of the reign of Augustus were read, and the apparent examples of the construction were collected. Then the attempt was made to interpret every one of the examples otherwise than as an indirect question: as a direct question, as an exclamation, as a relative clause, as a condition, or in any other conceivable way.

[25] Cf., e.g., Norden on Aeneid VI 615: "Der Indikativ im abhängigen Fragesatze nach der Praxis sowohl des Altlateinischen als des Griechischen. Da er sich auch bei Properz, Ovid, und Späteren findet . . . so muss für Vergil das Griechische als massgebend betrachtet werden."

[26] Cf. Korn-Ehwald on Ovid Met. X 637; Lejay on Horace Serm. II 4, 38. On the other hand, in his note on Horace Ep. I 7, 39, Lejay calls the use of the indicative in an indirect question "un trait de la langue familière."

[27] The indicative was the original mood in this construction. Cf. Delbrück, *op. cit., supra*, 286.

[28] For the belief in the existence of a rigid Latin syntax, particularly in the Ciceronian age, cf. p. xviii, note 6.

It was found that some examples lent themselves more or less readily to such interpretation, while others could not possibly be explained as anything else than indirect questions.

The passages were accordingly separated into two divisions: indeterminate examples, and apparently certain examples of the indirect question. The indeterminate examples were further classified into five subdivisions. The first included those instances which might be considered direct questions; the second those which might be regarded as exclamations; the third those which might be considered relative clauses; the fourth those which might be considered conditions. The few miscellaneous examples which remained constituted the fifth subdivision. Sometimes it was found that an example might be put into more than one of the first four subdivisions. Such an example was cited only once, in that subdivision into which it fell most naturally or with the least forcing. The examples in the first four subdivisions were again divided, according as it seemed (1) indifferent whether they were interpreted as indirect questions or were interpreted in some other way, or (2) more natural to understand them as indirect questions than to understand them in any other way.

At first the classification was made on the basis of the writer's linguistic feeling. It was realized, however, that this feeling was a fallible guide, and so a search was made for objective standards. The direct question, the exclamation, the relative clause, and the condition were studied for the light which they might shed, and criteria for distinguishing indirect questions from those constructions were formulated. Then the classification of examples was revised by means of these criteria. It was found impossible to escape altogether from subjective methods in separating those instances which it seemed natural to interpret otherwise than as indirect questions, from those for which such interpretation seemed more or less unnatural, but still conceivable. There is no absolute distinction between a natural and a somewhat unnatural interpretation. On the other hand, the group composed of the examples which *must* be interpreted as indirect questions was determined wholly by objective standards.[29]

[29] To be sure, the validity of these standards and of their application depends upon the writer's range of observation. In so far as this is true, the subjective element is omnipresent.

To supplement the study of the indicative indirect question in the Augustan and earlier ages, a similar, but less comprehensive, study was made of the construction in later Latin. The study of the earlier period constitutes Part I of this book. The supplementary study constitutes Part II.

The lists of indeterminate examples are not meant to be exhaustive. I have cited all the instances which I have found, of clauses which are most naturally interpreted as indirect questions. However, the lists of clauses which may equally well be interpreted as indirect questions or as instances of other constructions are merely illustrative.

I have aimed to give a complete list of the certain examples of the indicative indirect question in the authors and the collections that I have read in their entirety. (These authors and collections are designated in the bibliography by asterisks.) I can, however, scarcely hope that I have succeeded. With the exception of Plautus, I have read my authors through once only, and though I have checked my collection by means of collections in various grammars and in studies of the syntax of individual authors, and by cross-references in editions of various works,[30] I have doubtless missed some examples. Further, in collecting the indicative indirect questions in many authors,[31] the lack of complete critical editions is a serious handicap.

In making citations, I have attempted to indicate all manuscript variations which are relevant to my problem. In choosing among variant readings I have, in part, followed the editions cited in the bibliography. However, I have not hesitated to form independent judgments, especially when editors differ among themselves, or when they seem to me to reject readings decidedly favored by the manuscripts, or not to give sufficient consideration to the *lectio difficilior*. In such cases I have often cited the readings of the editors in my critical notes (which are adapted from the editions cited in the bibliography). It is hardly possible that my choice of readings will always be correct, even when the choice is not rendered especially difficult by disagreement among authorities as to the relative value of manuscripts. However, as I strive to indicate all the relevant manuscript variations that are cited in the editions,[32]

[30] The books used for this purpose are included in the bibliography of this study, but are not designated in any particular way.

[31] Notably in Cicero. Cf. C. F. W. Mueller's remark in his edition (Leipzig, 1893-98), Part III, Vol. II, p. IV.

[32] In a few instances I do not cite the variant readings, but refer instead to critical notes in the editions.

it is to be hoped that any errors in judgment will not seriously impair the trustworthiness of this paper.

The examples are arranged according to the meaning (1) of the introductory verb or verbal expression and (2) of the introductory pronoun or conjunction; thus:

I	Ask	V	Hear
II	Inform	VI	See
II B	Discuss	VII	Concern
II C	Depict	VII B	Care
III	Find Out	VIII	Wonder
III B	Observe	IX	It is Incredible
III C	Count	X	No Verb Expressed (Chapter Headings, etc.)
III D	Determine, Judge		
III E	Consider, Reflect	XI	Reproach
IV	Know		

1	Quid	17	Quatenus
2	Quis	18	Quando
3	Quoia	19	Quam
4	Quae, etc.	19 B	Quamdiu
5	Qui (Masc. Sing. Substantive)	20	Ubi
6	Qua Causa, etc.	21	Unde
7	Quo Modo, etc.	22	Uter, etc.
8	Qualis, etc.	23	Ut
9	Qualiter	24	-Ne
10	Quantus, etc.	25	Num
11	Quot	26	Utrum
12	Quotus, etc.	27	An
13	Cur	28	Si
14	Qui (Adverb)	29	Ne
15	Quo	30	Various Connectives
16	Qua	31	Connectives Uncertain

The division according to the meaning of the introductory verb is of necessity sometimes rather arbitrary. Thus, *scire* may mean either "to know" or "to find out" (cf., for the latter meaning, Ter. Hec. 874: Ere licetne scire ex te hodie, quid sit quod feci boni, . . . ?), and sometimes the meaning may be indeterminate. However, the *Index Locorum* will facilitate the finding of the examples.

PART I—A STUDY OF THE CONSTRUCTION TO THE END OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE

CHAPTER I

An Attempt at Defining the Direct and the Indirect Question

Before trying to distinguish between direct and indirect questions, it would be well if one could have a clear idea of what the term "question" and the terms "direct" and "indirect," as applied to questions, mean. In the first place, what is a question? The answer is not easy. No satisfactory definition of the word "question" has ever, so far as I can find, been worked out. Nor can I frame one. Nevertheless, a discussion is here in place, and may perhaps lead some one else to make the attempt with success.

I have searched a considerable number of grammatical works for a definition, but could find none. Writers both on comparative grammar and on the grammar of particular languages have refrained from defining the word.

The definitions given in dictionaries are imperfect. For example, in the Funk and Wagnalls *New Standard Dictionary of the English Language* (New York and London, 1913) we find, *s. v.* "question," the following: "An interrogative sentence calling for an answer; a request for information; an inquiry." "Interrogative sentence" and "inquiry" are, of course, synonyms, rather than definitions, of the term question. The definition, "a request for information," is defective, for it includes too much. "Please explain to me the meaning of this word" is a request for information, but is not a question. A definition of the term "question" should specify *in what way* the request for information is expressed.

E. T. Owen, in *Interrogative Thought and the Means of its Expression* (Madison, Wis., 1903) gives a preliminary definition which seems to me correct as far as it goes. He says, p. 408: "Answering now the possible query 'What interrogation is,' I feel it safe to say, in a general way, that it is one of several linguistic means of inducing another mind to give particular information." In the development of this thought, however, I do not wholly agree with him. In particular, he over-emphasizes the importance of "specially question-asking" words. He thinks that such words are used not only in questions of the type, "Who killed Lincoln?" but also in so-called sentence-questions: e.g., "Is Brown honest?" "It appears," he says, pp. 463 ff., "that, just as in 'Who killed Lincoln?' the 'Who?' is regarded as the specially interrogative symbol, so also in 'Is Brown honest?' the 'Is' may be regarded as the specially question-asking word." It seems clear, on the contrary, that in the latter sentence interrogation is expressed by the word-order and the inflection of the voice, and not by "Is."

I agree with Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (Halle, 1898), pp. 121 ff., that there are various means of expressing interrogation: (1) inflection of the voice; (2) a question-asking word; (3) word-order. These means may be used singly or together. I should, then, define a question as a sentence which, by one or more of these means, conveys a desire for information.[1] This definition combines Owen's preliminary definition of the question and Paul's enumeration of the means of expressing interrogation. It should be noted that "question," in the definition, as in the passages cited from Paul, Owen, and the Funk and Wagnalls dictionary, means question in the narrow sense, i.e., the direct, and not the indirect, question.

The definition given is not perfect, for it is formal. It does not explain what a question is, either psychologically or historically. Even as a formal definition, it has faults. In the first place, it is hardly legitimate to use the term "question-asking word" in the definition of a question. In the second place, since the term "sentence" is used, it ought perhaps to be explained what definition of the sentence is adopted. However, the definition given is adequate

[1] The definition is meant to apply to the Indo-European languages in general, not to Latin in particular.

for the present study. Its purpose is to help in the discrimination of the indirect, from the direct, question.

What we have been trying to define, and what the passages cited from Owen and Paul are concerned with, is the question in the narrow sense, i.e., the direct, and not the indirect, question. Let us try now to understand what an indirect question is.

Scholars sometimes speak as if the difference between the direct and the indirect question were, that the former is independent and the latter dependent. Cf., e.g., Kühner-Stegmann, Vol. II, Part II, p. 487, §226, 1: "Die Fragen sind entweder unabhängig (direkt) oder von einem übergeordneten Satze abhängig (indirekt)." However, a direct question may be in a sense dependent, as in "He asked, 'What have you there?'" It may be, too, that an indirect question is sometimes independent. Cf. German, "Ob das wohl wahr ist."[2]

Perhaps it would be more exact to say that a direct question expresses a judgment,[3] and an indirect question a mere conception. But just what kind of conception does an indirect question express? And what do the direct and the indirect question have in common, that they should both be called in part by the same name, question? Here again we face difficulties.

If we were to say that a direct question expresses an interrogative judgment and an indirect question an interrogative conception, we should next have to define the term interrogative. I have defined a direct question as a sentence which by certain definite means expresses a request for information. Might an indirect question be defined as a clause which suggests—but does not express—a desire for information by certain definite means (which would still need to be determined)? In that case, the term interrogative would signify, "expressing or suggesting a desire for information by certain definite means."

But *does* an indirect question suggest a desire for information? Or is such suggestion, when there is such suggestion, made by the introductory verb? It may be thought that the indirect question

[2] Some scholars would doubtless explain such clauses as dependent, with ellipsis of the introductory verb.

[3] Owen, *op. cit.*, 409, calls the (direct) question a judgment.

in itself suggests a desire for information, and that the introductory verb confirms or negatives this suggestion. *Scire volo quid putes* might illustrate the former effect of the introductory verb, and *Scire nolo quid putes* might illustrate the latter. *Quid putes* in itself is precisely the same in the two instances. However, I doubt whether it is accurate to speak of the indirect question as having any particular force *in itself*. The force of an indirect question, and of many kinds of dependent clauses, is determined very largely by the context.

It seems, accordingly, that an indirect question must be defined, if it is to be defined, in relation to a context. One might then say: "An indirect question is a clause which gives the content of a question but does not itself express a desire for information." This would distinguish between the direct question in "Rogavit, 'Quid habes?'" and the indirect question in "Rogavit quid haberem." But the definition breaks down when it is applied to a sentence like "Sciebam quid Marcus fecisset." It is not true, or not necessarily true, that "Quid Marcus fecisset" gives the content of a question. "Sciebam quid Marcus fecisset" does not mean, "I knew the answer to the question about what Mark had done." A person may know, and say that he knows, what another person has done, without ever having had a question about that other person's action arise in his mind. Many things come to our knowledge without our inquiring about them. One may say, "Sciebam quid Marcus fecisset" without thinking of any question (in the narrow sense, i.e., any direct question) whether present, past, or future, and whether one's own or another's, and indeed without experiencing any feeling of inquiry. In other words, many so-called indirect questions are strictly not questions at all. They neither express nor imply desire for information.

More or less awareness of this fact is indicated by the distinction that is sometimes made between "proper" and "improper" (*eigentliche* and *uneigentliche*) indirect questions. Indirect questions that occur after verbs which show that some one is inquiring[4] are regarded as "proper" indirect questions; all others as "improper" indirect questions. So the dependent clause in "I asked what you were doing" would be of the former kind; that in "I knew what you were

[4] These indirect questions are indirect quotations. Cf. p. 89, n. 5.

doing" would be of the latter kind. Cf. Kühner-Stegmann, Vol. II, Part II, §226, 2. Cf. also the references to earlier scholars in Becker, p. 212.

The term "indirect question," we have seen, is commonly applied to a group of constructions which differ so widely from one another that it is difficult, if not impossible, to frame a definition which shall apply to them all. These constructions belong together historically, and it is right that they should be called by the same name. But the task of defining the name involves difficulties which have not yet been overcome.

Though I have been able to give only an imperfect definition of the direct question, and have been wholly unsuccessful in my attempt at defining the indirect question, yet the present chapter has, I hope, made it sufficiently clear what the difference between a direct and an indirect question is. A direct question expresses a desire for information. An indirect question does not express this desire. It may give the content of some direct question, but it does not necessarily do so.

CHAPTER II

Indeterminate Examples: Indirect or Direct Questions

I. Questions whose Interpretation is Indifferent

There are many indicative questions in Latin which might well be interpreted either as direct or as indirect.[1] That this should be true is in harmony with the generally accepted theory that the indirect originated from the direct question.[2] Examples follow. The list is not meant to be in any sense exhaustive, but consists merely of illustrations. I have punctuated the questions as indirect, though it would be quite possible to punctuate them as direct.

I. Ask

13. Cur.

Varro, L. L. VIII 38, 70:

> Si analogia est, inquit, cur populus dicit dei penates, dei consentes. . . . ? Item quaerunt, si sit analogia, *cur appellant* omnes aedem deum consentium et non deorum consentium. Item cur dicatur mille denarium, non mille denariorum.

[1] This fact has been repeatedly observed. Cf., e.g., Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, 71. Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax*, Vol. III, 276, implies that there are degrees of closeness in the logical relationship between a question and the verb used with it. However, the existence of various degrees of logical subordination need not concern us here. What we are studying is syntactical, rather than logical, relations. Syntactically every question belongs to one of three classes: it is dependent, independent, or indeterminate.

[2] Cf., e.g., Kühner-Stegmann, Vol. II, Part II, §227, 2. For what seems to me the probable way in which the indirect question sprang from the direct, see my "Theory of the Origin of Hypotaxis," *Indogermanische Forschungen*, XXXV (1915), 242.

The Goetz-Schoell edition, as its punctuation indicates, takes the question *cur appellant* to be directly quoted. On that interpretation, the mood of *dicatur*, in the following sentence, would express propriety. For the subjunctive of obligation or propriety, cf. Hale-Buck, *Latin Grammar*, §§512 ff.

25. Num.

C. Licin. Macer Calvus (Meyer p. 476): Rogo vos, iudices, num, si iste disertus est, ideo me damnari oportet.

II. Inform

1. Quid.

Plaut. Amph. 421: Signi dic quid est.

As. 358: Quid nunc consili captandum censes dice.

Aul. 645: Atque id quoque iam fiet, nisi fatere *L. S.* Quid fatear tibi?
Euc. Quid abstulisti hinc.

M. G. 441: Dic mihi
Quid hic tibi in Epheso est negoti.

Poen. 1027: Narra quid est.

2. Quis.

Plaut. Bacch. 553: Obsecro hercle, loquere quis is est.

Merc. 620: Dic quis emit.

14. Qui (Adverb)

Plaut. Bacch. 1157: Nihili sum. *Ni.* Istuc iam pridem scio.
Sed qui nihili's id memora.[3]

20. Ubi.

Plaut. Merc. 606: Dice, obsecro,
Si neque hic neque Accherunti sum, ubi sum.

22. Uter, etc.

Plaut. Aul. 321: Sed uter uostrorum est celerior, memora mihi.

[3] *qui* Guietus: *quid* cod. *Nihile sit* cod. (*nihili sit* B).

24. -Ne.

Cic. Att. XV, 13, 6: Sed perscribe, quaeso, quae causa sit Myrtilo (poenas quidem illum pependisse audivi), et satisne patet unde corruptus.[4]

It may be that a new sentence, a direct question, begins with *et*. Cf. p. 11.

25. Num.

Cic. De Orat. II, 65, 261: Dic mihi, inquit, M. Pinari, num, si contra te dixero, mihi male dicturus es, ut ceteris fecisti.

III. Find Out

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Curc. 543: Th. Scire uolo quoi reddidisti. Ly. Lusco liberto tuo.

13. Cur.

Pomponius Bononiensis, Ribbeck, II, p. 240, 102: Volo scire ex te, cur urbanas res desubito deseris.[5]

IV. Know

24.—Ne.

Virg. Aen. II, 739: Hic mihi nescio quod trepido male numen amicum
Confusam eripuit mentem. Namque avia cursu
Dum sequor et nota excedo regione viarum,
Heu! misero coniunx fato*ne*[6] erepta Creusa
Substitit, *erravitne* via, seu lassa resedit
Incertum, nec post oculis est reddita nostris.

Most editions give the above punctuation and evidently regard both the *-ne* clauses and *seu . . . resedit* as indirect

[4] *pateat* Mue. and other edd.: *patet* codd.
[5] *deseres* Par. P.
[6] *fato mi* Ribbeck.

questions depending upon *incertum*. A few punctuate with question-marks after *substitit* and *resedit*. So the Fairclough-Brown edition (Boston, 1913), with the comment: "The disjointed utterances express realistically mental agitation. The *-ne* is appended to *fato*, because the phrase, in which that noun is so important a word, belongs in common to the three verbs following. The *seu*, used instead of an interrogative, implies closer connection between the last two verbs than between *substitit* and *erravit*."

VI. See

25. Num.

Plaut. Most. 472: Circumspicedum, numquis est
Sermonem nostrum qui aucupet.

VIII. Wonder

1. Quid.

Plaut. Rud. 614: Sed quid hic in Veneris fano meae viciniae
Clamoris oritur, animus miratur meus.

30. Various Connectives.

Ter. Phorm. 234: Quid mihi dicent aut quam causam reperient
Demiror.

II. Questions Which, if an Indicative Indirect Question Exists, are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect, than as Direct

1. *Introductory.* There are a considerable number of questions which may be direct but are more naturally understood as indirect. Just why they are more naturally so understood, one cannot always say. Indeed, there is no clear-cut division between these examples

and those which have just been cited (cf. p. xxix). There are, however, a number of circumstances to which one may point as indications that questions are indirect.

Direct questions are of two kinds: some are quotations, and some are not. An example of a direct question which is a quotation, is, "'Where have you been?' he asked." It will simplify our task if we consider separately (1) those clauses which, if they are not indirect questions, will be most naturally interpreted as direct questions that are not quotations; and (2) those clauses which, if they are not indirect questions, will be most naturally interpreted as direct questions that *are* quotations.

2. *Indications that Questions are Indirect, rather than Direct and Not Quoted.* In order to show that a question is indirect, rather than direct and not quoted, it is sufficient to show that it is dependent; for a direct question is never dependent, unless it is a quotation (cf. p. 3). This should be borne in mind as we proceed.

(1) In the first place, a question is very probably dependent if it intervenes between another question and the answer to this other question. Cf. Plaut. Men. 207: Scin quid uolo ego te accurare? *Er.* Scio: curabo quae uoles. It is conceivable that when a person has said, "Do you know? What do I want you to attend to?," the reply "I know" should be given. However, this reply is more appropriate to the question, "Do you know what I want you to attend to?"

(2) If a question seems to interrupt the introductory clause, it is probably dependent. It will be shown below (p. 90) that a question which interrupts the introductory clause is dependent, but that it is not always possible to determine whether a question does interrupt the introductory clause. The examples in which it seems probable, but is not certain, that the question interrupts the introductory clause, are cited here. An instance is Plaut. Pers. 640: Sed tamen, virgo, quae patriast tua, age mi actutum expedi. Here it seems probable that *sed tamen* goes with *age. . . . expedi*, and that the *quae*-clause is, therefore, dependent. Still it is *possible* that *sed tamen* belongs to the *quae*-clause and that this is, accordingly, a direct question.

(3) The grammatical or logical relations in which the introductory verb stands to other verbs may favor the interpretation of a question

as dependent. So in Cic. Rep. I, 19, 31, Tum Tubero: Non dissentio a te, Laeli, sed quaero quae tu esse maiora intellegis, the compound structure of the introductory sentence favors this interpretation. In Plaut. Pseud. 18, the logical relation of *face certum* and *iuvabo* has the same effect: Face me certum quid tibist; Iuvabo aut re<d>aut opera aut consilio bono.

(4) The circumstance that the introductory verb is modified by an adverb or a phrase, may make it more natural to understand the question as dependent than as independent. Cf. Plaut. Bacch. 558: *Mn.* Nequam homost, verum hercle amicus est tibi. *Pi.* Tanto magis Dic quis est.

(5) If the verb that accompanies an indicative question introduces another question which exhibits mood-shift and which is, therefore, clearly indirect, it is natural to interpret the indicative question too as indirect. Cf. Ter. Phormio 380: Quem amicum tuum ais fuisse istum explana mihi, Et qui cognatum me sibi esse diceret. This is not a sure criterion, for a speaker may conceivably change from a direct to an indirect question. So in the Phormio passage cited, it is possible—though, as it seems to me, not probable—that *Quem . . . ais . . .* is a direct question, followed by a shift to an indirect question: *explana* (understood) *qui . . . diceret.*

Of course, an indirect question is often followed by a direct question that has no verb accompanying it. Accordingly, in Cic. Att. XV, 13, 6 (cited p. 8) the indicative question may quite well be interpreted as direct.

(6) With verbs or phrases that do not express a desire of the speaker for information, an indirect question yields smoother Latin than a direct one. *Dic* may equally well accompany a direct or an indirect question. On the other hand, *dicam* or the like may conceivably be used with a direct question, but yields smoother Latin when used with an indirect question. An example is Ovid Rem. Am. 683: Sed quid praecipue nostris conatibus obstat, Eloquar exemplo quemque docente suo. In general, it is more natural to interpret a question used in such an example as indirect than as direct; that is, it is more natural to punctuate, *Quid . . . obstat, eloquar,* than *Quid . . . obstat? Eloquar.*

3. Examples of Questions More Naturally[7] *Interpreted as Indirect, than as Direct and Not Quoted*

I. Ask

1. Quid.

Plaut. M. G. 809: Meminero: sed quid meminisse id refert <rogo>[8] ego te tamen.

4. Quae, etc.

Cic. Rep. I 19, 31: Tum Tubero: Non dissentio a te, Laeli, sed quaero quae tu esse maiora intellegis.[9]

24. -Ne.

Cic. Flac. 32, 80: Illud quaero, suntne[10] ista praedia censui censendo, habeant ius civile, sint necne sint mancipi, subsignari apud aerarium aut apud censorem possint.

It would be harsh to interpret this passage as showing a shift from a direct to an indirect question. Cf. p. 11, criterion 5.

II. Inform

1. Quid.

Plaut. Aul. 777: Sat habeo. Age nunc loquere quid vis.

Capt. 964: Tandem istaec aufer; dic quid fers, ut feras hinc quod petis.

Epid. 274: Quin tu eloquere, quid faciemus?[11]

[7] The examples vary greatly in the degree in which it is more natural to interpret them as indirect questions. Some of the examples may almost as well be direct, as indirect, questions. Others are almost certainly indirect questions. In many of them, editors have "emended" the indicative to the subjunctive, because they felt that the questions were indirect. In most cases my feeling agrees with the editors'. I cite these passages here, because I do not wish to include in Chapter VIII any passages which are not quite certainly indirect questions.

[8] Lindsay, following Brix, inserts *rogo*. A is illegible.

[9] *intelleg*$^{i}_{a}$*s* cod: *intellegas* edd.

[10] *suntne* P: *sintne* Camerarius, edd.

[11] This is a question of deliberation. Cf. M. G. 1183 (cited below); Stich. 706 (p. 22); Lucil. 375 (p. 27); Lucan II, 682 (p. 113). (In two of the examples the present tense is used.) For the use of the indicative mood in *direct* questions of

Men. 763: Sed haec res mihi in pectore et corde cura est,
Quidnam hoc sit negoti quod sic filia
Repente expetit me, ut ad sese irem.
Nec quid id sit mihi certius facit, quid
Velit, *quid* me *accersit.*[12]

M. G. 1183: Quid? Ubi ero exornatus quin tu dicis quid facturus sum?[13]

Poen. 1087: *Mi.* Festivum facinus venit mihi in mentem modo.
Ha. Quid id est? *Mi.* Tua opust opera.
Ha. Dic mihi *quid lubet.*
Profecto uteris, ut uoles, operam meam.

Pseud. 18: Face me certum quid tibist;
Iuvabo aut re<d> aut opera aut consilio bono.[14]

Rud. 946: Quin loquere *quid uis.*
— — — — — — — — — — — — — —
Eloquere<n> *quid* id *est?*
— — — — — — — — — — — — — —
Quid negoti *est,* modo dice.

Rud. 1102: *Da.* Gripe, aduorte animum. Tu paucis expedi quid postulas.
Tr. Dixi equidem, sed si parum intellexti, dicam denuo.

---

deliberation, cf. Plaut., Capt. 535, Quid loquar? Quid fabulabor? Quid negabo aut quid fatebor? Cf. also J. P. Deane, "Deliberative Questions, Indicative and Subjunctive, in Terence," *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* XXI (1890), pp. XXXIII ff., and Hale-Buck §571. Apart from the present example and the four parallels cited, all of our instances of the indicative indirect question are clauses of *fact.*

[12] *quod velit, quod,* Fowler. *accersat,* Lambinus. This is the punctuation of Leo. A direct question, "Quid me accersit?" as Goetz-Schoell and Lindsay have it, seems to me possible, but very awkward.

[13] *sum* A: *sim* P, Leo, Goetz-Schoell, Lindsay. Cf. the comment on Epid. 274 above.

[14] *tibi sit* F Z.

Accius, Ribbeck I, p. 201, 499: Praesto etiam adsum.
Exprome quid fers:[15] nam te longo <ab> itere cerno huc vadere.

Ter. Phor. 1048: Tu tuum nomen dic mihi quid est.[16]

Ovid, Rem. Am. 683: Sed quid praecipue nostris conatibus obstat,
Eloquar exemplo quemque docente suo.[17]

2. Quis.

Plaut. Bacch. 558: *Mn.* Nequam homost, verum hercle amicus est tibi. *Pi.* Tanto magis
Dic quis est.

3. Quoia.

Plaut. Merc. 529: *Ly.* Nunc, mulier, ne tu frustra sis, mea non es, ne arbitrere.
Pa. Dic igitur, quaeso, quoia sum.

Merc. 722: *Ly.* Quoia ea sit rogitas? *Do.* Resciscam tamen.
Ly. Vin dicam quoiast? Illa—illa edepol—vae mihi!
Nescio quid dicam.[18]

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Pers. 640: *Do.* At ego patriam te rogo quae sit tua.
Vi. Quae mihi sit nisi haec ubi nunc sum? *Do.* At ego illam quaero quae fuit.
Vi. Omne ego pro nilo esse duco quod fuit, quando fuit.

. . . . . .

[15] *feras* Buecheler.

[16] *quid est* A *quod est* BCDP. This is apparently an indirect question with prolepsis. For prolepsis, cf. Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, pp. 75 ff.

[17] Thus R. Edd. give various readings. It would be harsh to interpret this *quid*-clause as a direct question. However, it would not be absolutely impossible; for a person may ask a question whose answer he knows, merely to bring a subject to the attention of his audience.

[18] Becker (p. 285) would explain away the indicative indirect question by distributing: "L. Vin dicam? D. Quoiast?" This punctuation, like Goetz-Schoell's "Vin dicam? Quoiast?"—for which cf. the comment on Ovid, Rem. Am. 683, cited above—seems less natural than that of Leo and of Lindsay, which I have adopted.

To. Ita me di bene ament, sapienter; atque
equidem miseret tamen.
Sed tamen, virgo, *quae patriast* tua age mihi
actutum expedi.[19]

Ter. Phorm. 380: Adulescens, primum abs te hoc bona venia peto,
Si tibi placere potis est, mi ut respondeas:
Quem amicum tuom *ais* fuisse istum explana
mihi,
Et qui cognatum me sibi esse diceret.[20]

Cic. Att. II 10: Nunc fac ut sciam, quo die te visuri sumus.[21]

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Cic. Att. VIII 2, 2: Nihil arbitror fore, quod reprehendas. Si qua erunt, doce me, quo modo μέμψιν effugere possum.[22]

14. Qui (Adverb)

Plaut. Pseud. 866: *Co.* Habe modo bonum animum. *Ba.* Quaeso qui possum doce[23]
Bonum animum habere qui te ad me adducam
domum.

20. Ubi.

Plaut. Bacch. 203: Dic ubi ea nunc est, obsecro.

Merc. 602: Prius quam recipias anhelitum,
Uno verbo eloquere ubi ego sum, hicine an apud
mortuos.

Merc. 901: Dic igitur, ubi illa est.

Pseud. 599: Nimis velim
Certum qui <i>d mihi faciat, Ballio leno ubi[24]
hic habitat.

[19] Becker, p. 138, cites this passage among the examples in which he accounts for the indicative mood as due to parataxis. It seems to me most natural to regard the *quae*-clause as an indirect question. Cf. p. 10, criterion 2.

[20] It is most natural to consider the indicative question as indirect, and parallel to the subjunctive one, *qui . . . diceret.* See p. 11, criterion 5.

[21] *simus* Müller and other edd.: *sumus* M. As Skutsch has pointed out, *Glotta III (1912) 366*, the indicative yields a better rhythm than the subjunctive. But cf. p. 106, n. 1.

[22] *possum* M, *possim* Müller and other edd.

[23] *possim* P. *doce* om. A.

[24] Becker, p. 311, interprets the *ubi*-clause as relative, with *locum* understood. I should consider it a little less forced to interpret it as a direct question. However, the most natural interpretation by far is that the clause is an indirect question. Indeed Becker, *l.c.*, n. 3, says that *habitat* should perhaps be emended to *habitet* or *habeat.*

21. Unde.

Plaut. Cist. 748: Sed quaeso ambages, mulier, mitte atque hoc age:
Eloquere unde haec sunt tibi cito crepundia.[25]

22. Uter, etc.

Plaut. Men. 779: Loquere uter meruistis culpam, paucis, non longos logos.

III. Find Out

1. Quid.

Plaut. Aul. 780: *Euc.* Sat habeo. Age nunc loquere quid vis. *Ly.* Si me novisti minus,
Genere quo sim gnatus: hic mihi est Megadorus auonculus,
Meus fuit pater Antimachus, ego uocor Lycon-ides,
Mater est Eunomia. *Euc.* Novi genus: nunc *quid vis* id uolo noscere.[26]

Truc. 261: Sed uolo scire, quid debetur hic tibi nostrae domi.

Ter. Hec. 874: *Par.* Ere, licetne scire ex te hodie, quid sit quod feci boni,
Aut quid istuc est quod vos agitis? *Pam.* Non licet.

Becker, p. 220, thinks that *non licet*, which answers *licetne?* clearly shows that *quid . . . est* is an indirect question, although on this interpretation the example opposes his theory and calls for an emendation of *est* to *sit*. The editors, however, place a question-mark after 873 and take *quid . . . est* as a direct question. Gaffiot, "Quelques cas d' interrogation indirecte," *Rev. de phil.* XXVIII (1904) p. 53, argues for the latter interpretation. It seems to me that though it is *possible* to interpret

[25] Becker, p. 133, classes this example among those in which the indicative mood is due to parataxis. The position of *cito*—which is, however, in any case peculiar—seems to me to favor the interpretation that the *unde*-clause is an indirect question.

[26] The editors place *?* after *vis*. However, it seems to me most likely that *nunc* modifies *volo noscere*, *nunc volo noscere* being opposed to *novi*; and that *quid vis* is, therefore, inserted into the main clause and is an indirect question. Cf. p. 10, criterion 2.

with Gaffiot and the editors, " 'May I find out what good deed I have done? Or what are you up to?' 'You may not,' " the natural interpretation is: " 'May I find out what good deed I have done or what you are up to?' 'You may not.' " Cf. p. 10, criterion 1.

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Stich. 106: Uostrum animum adhiberi uolo;
Nam ego ad uos nunc imperitus rerum et morum
mulierum
Discipulus venio ad magistras, *quibus* matronas
moribus
Quae optumae sunt esse *oportet*;[27] sed utraque
ut dicat mihi.

15. Quo.

Plaut. Trin. 938: Sed ego sum insipientior,
Qui egomet unde redeam hunc rogitem, quae
ego sciam atque hic nesciat:
Nisi quia lubet experiri quo evasurust denique.[28]

30. Various Connectives.

Prop. III 5, 27: Atque ubi iam Venerem gravis interceperit
aetas
Sparserit et nigras alba senecta comas,
Tum mihi naturae libeat perdiscere mores,
Quis deus hanc mundi temperet arte domum,
Qua venit exoriens, *qua deficit*, *unde* coactis
Cornibus in plenum menstrua luna *redit*,
Unde salo *superant* venti, quid flamine captet
Eurus, et in nubes unde perennis aqua;
Sit ventura dies mundi quae subruat arces,
Purpureus pluvias *cur bibit* arcus aquas,

[27] *oporteto* A. Becker's interpretation (p. 313) that the clause is relative seems to me extremely forced. The interpretation of Leo and Lindsay, who place a question-mark after *oportet*, is much more probable, and yet is not, it seems to me, so natural as the understanding of the clause as an indirect question. The edition of Goetz-Schoell has a colon after *magistras* and a comma after *oportet*.

[28] To interpret this clause either as a direct question, or—with Becker, p. 311—as a relative clause with *locum* understood, would be so forced as to be practically impossible.

Aut *cur* Perrhaebi *tremuere* cacumina Pindi,
Solis et atratis luxerit orbis equis,
Cur serus versare boves et plaustra Bootes,
Pleiadum spisso *cur coit* igne chorus,
Curve suos fines altum non exeat aequor,
Plenus et in partes quattuor annus eat;
Sub terris sint iura deum et tormenta Gigantum,
Tisiphones atro si furit angue caput,
Aut Alcmaeoniae furiae aut ieiunia Phinei,
Num rota, num scopuli, num sitis inter aquas,
Num tribus infernum *custodit* faucibus antrum
Cerberus, et Tityo iugera pauca novem,
An ficta in miseras *descendit* fabula gentis,
Et timor haud ultra quam rogus esse potest.[29]

IIID. Determine, Judge

4. Quae, etc.

Cato Agr. Cult. VI 4: Vineam quo in agro conseri oportet, sic observato.[30]

Cic. In Toga Candida (Clark ed. Asconius, p. 87,

[29] 33 *cum* F. 39 *sunt* V². It would be extremely forced to interpret the indicative clauses differently from the subjunctive ones. The *si*-clause in vs. 40 *must* be an indirect question, since a condition would not make sense. Wolff, *De Enuntiatis Interrogativis*, p. 39, mentions this passage as containing indirect questions, and as showing, "quam tenue sit ac paene nullum inter coniunctivum et indicativum discrimen."

[30] It is conceivable, though not at all probable, that the *quo*-clause is a direct question. Becker, p. 313, calls it a relative clause. He comments, n. 1: "Varro tamen cum de R. R. Lib. I. C. XXV hoc caput ex Catone transferret, suae aetatis loquendi usui inserviens modum coniunctivum posuit: Vinea quo in agro serunda sit, sic observandum." To me the indicative example is just as clearly interrogative as is the subjunctive example. The meaning is certainly not: "Observe the field in which—."

21): Me qua amentia inductus est ut contemneret, constituere non possum.[31]

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

2. Quis.

Plaut. Pseud. 262: *Ps.* Nosce saltem hunc *quis est.* *Ba.* Iam diu scio
Qui fuit: nunc qui is est ipsus sciat.[32]

IV. Know

1. Quid.

Plaut. Men. 207: Scin quid uolo ego te accurare? *Er.* Scio: curabo quae uoles.

Men. 677: Scin quid est quod ego ad te venio? *Er.* Scio, ut tibi ex me sit uolup.

Pseud. 276: Sed scin quid nos uolumus? *Ba.* Pol ego prope modum: ut male sit mihi.

Pseud. 657: Sed scin quid te oro, Sure? *Ps.* Sciam, si dixeris.[33]

Men. 425: Sed scin quid te amabo ut facias? *Men.* Impera quid vis modo.

Men. 947: Scin quid facias optumum est?
Ad me face uti deferatur.

Men. 1154: *Mes.* Scitin quid ego vos rogo?
Men. Quid? *Mes.* Praeconium mi ut detis.

Poen. 1167: Haecin meae sunt filiae?
Quantae e quantillis iam sunt factae! *Ag.* Scin quid est?
Thraecae sunt: in celonem sustolli solent.

[31] *est* codd.: *sit* Madvig, Clark. It is barely conceivable that a new sentence begins with *constituere* and that the preceding question is direct.

[32] Becker, p. 166, interprets the clause as a direct question. His interpretation seems to me extremely forced. The natural understanding of the clause is that it is an indirect question with prolepsis. For prolepsis cf. Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, pp. 75 ff.

[33] *oro* A, edd.: *orem* P.

In these four passages, the fact that the clauses under consideration intervene between *scin?* and the reply to *scin*, strongly favors the interpretation that the clauses are indirect questions. Cf. p. 10, criterion 1.

Pseud. 538: At enim scin quid mihi in mentem venit?

Pseud. 641: *Ps.* Si intus esset, euocarem. Verum si dare vis mihi,
Magis erit solutum quasi ipsi dederis. *Harp.* At enim scin quid est?
Reddere hoc, non perdere erus me misit.

Rud. 773: Scin quid tecum oro, senex?
Ut illas serves, vim defendas, dum ego erum adduco meum.

Rud. 1216: Sed scin quid est quod te uolo?

Trin. 350: Sed civi inmuni scin quid cantari solet?
'Quod habes ne habeas et illuc quod non habes habeas, malum. . . . .'

Accius, Ribbeck I, p. 160, 191 (Nonius 524, 25): Ah dubito quid agis: cave ne in turbam te implices.[34]

Pacuvius, Ribbeck I, p. 113, 294: Sed nescio quidnam est: animi horrescit, gliscit gaudium.[35]

Ter. Eun. 338: Scin quid ego te uolebam?

Hec. 753: *La.* Lepida es. Sed scin quid uolo potius sodes facias?
Ba. Quid? Cedo.

H. T. 494: Scin quid nunc facere te uolo?

Cic. Att. VII 12, 2: Si manet, vereor ne exercitum firmum habere non possit; sin discedit, quo aut qua, aut quid nobis agendum est, nescio.[36]

Att. XIV 13, 2: Quamvis enim tu magna et mihi iucunda scripseris de D. Bruti adventu ad suas legiones, in quo spem maximam video, tamen, si est

[34] Becker, p. 228, would change to *agas*.

[35] *horrescit et gliscit* codd. Becker, p. 235, takes exception to the manuscript reading, both because it is unmetrical and because he objects to the indicative.

[36] Thus M, Gaffiot (Pour le vrai latin 70): *sit* many edd.: *est?* Orelli.

bellum civile futurum, quod certe erit . . .
quid nobis *faciendum est* ignoro.[37]

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Men. 744: Quem tu † hominem arbitrare, nescio?[38]

19. Quam.

Plaut. Pers. 139: Posterius istuc tamen potest. *To.* Scin quam potest?

Poen. 1319: Nam te cinaedum esse arbitror magis quam virum.
Ag. Scin *quam* cinaedus *sum?* Ite istinc servi, foras,
Ecferte fustis.[39]

23. Ut.

Plaut. Stich. 113: *Pam.* Edepol, pater,
Scio ut oportet esse: si sint — ita ut ego aequom censeo.
An. Uolo scire ergo ut aequom censes.

30. Various Connectives.

Plaut. Bacch. 664: Sed lubet scire quantum aurum erus sibi
Dempsit et quid suo reddidit patri.[40]

V. Hear

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Ter. Eun. 100: Sed huc qua gratia
Te accersi iussi ausculta.[41]

[37] *est* M, Gaffiot (l.c.), *sit* edd.

It is most natural to understand *tamen* as a modifier of *ignoro*. In that case the *quid*-clause must, because of its position, be an indirect question. To understand *tamen* with the *quid*-clause ("Nevertheless, what am I to do?"), would be practically impossible.

[38] *arbitrare* codd., Goetz-Schoell: *arbitrere* Lindsay, Leo, Goetz-Schoell-Loewe, Becker (p. 240).

[39] Becker's interpretation of these two examples as direct questions (p. 279) is extremely forced.

[40] This passage is in a soliloquy. It is possible that, as Gaffiot thinks (*Rev. de phil.*, XXVIII, pp. 5 ff.), the speaker is addressing direct questions to himself. It seems more natural, however, to understand the clauses under debate as indirect questions.

[41] Becker, p. 309, would make the clause relative: "Supple: id, cuius gratia"; but that seems to me impossible.

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Cic. Verr. Act. II, I 28, 72: Verum ista damnatio tamen *cuius modi fuit*, audite, quaeso, iudices, et aliquando miseremini sociorum et ostendite aliquid iis in vestra fide praesidii esse oportere.[42]

VI. See

1. Quid.

Plaut. Bacch. 29: Sin lenocinium forte collubitumst tibi,
Videas mercedis quid tibist aequom dari,
Ne istac aetate me sectere gratiis.

Cas. 378: Vide quid scriptumst.[43]

Rud. 592: Nunc lenonem quid agit intus visam, convivam meum.[44]

2. Quis.

Plaut. Truc. 499: Vide [t] *quis* loquitur tam propinque.[45]

Ter Phorm. 840: Sed ostium concrepuit abs te. *An.* Vide quis egreditur.
Ph. Getast.[46]

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Rud. 1002: Vide sis quoius arbitratu nos vis facere.

11. Quot.

Plaut. Stich. 706: Vide quot cyathos bibimus. *St.* Tot quot digiti tibi sunt in manu.[47]

[42] *fuerit*, cod. Lg. 29, Müller: *fuit* the other codd.

[43] *quod* E J F Z *scriptum* (*est* add. B^2). This is the punctuation of Goetz-Schoell, Leo, and Lindsay.

[44] *agit* codd., Goetz-Schoell, Lindsay: *agat* Camerarius, Leo. Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.*, XXVIII, pp. 49 ff., suggests the punctuation, "Nunc lenon-em quid agit? Intus visam convivam meum." This interpretation seems to me extremely forced.

[45] This is the punctuation of Goetz-Schoell, Leo, and Lindsay.

[46] This is the punctuation of Tyrrell and of Elmer.

[47] *Quot . . . bibimus* is a question, not of fact, but of deliberation. Cf. the comment on Epid. 274 (p. 12).

19. Quam.

Plaut. Amph. 360: *Me.* Faciam ego hodie te superbum, nisi hinc abis. *So.* Quonam modo?
Me. Auferere, non abibis, si ego fustem sumpsero.
So. Quin me esse huius familiai familiarem praedico.
Me. Vide sis *quam* mox vapulare *uis*, nisi actutum hinc abis.

22. Uter, etc.

Ter. Adel. 195: Nunc vide utrum vis, argentum accipere an causam meditari tuam.

24. -Ne.

Plaut. Aul. 65: Nunc ibo ut visam, estne ita aurum ut condidi,
Quod me sollicitat plurumis miserum modis.[48]

Bacch. 901: Illa autem in arcem abiit aedem uisere
Minervae. Nunc apertast. I, vise estne ibi.[49]

25. Num.

Plaut. Most. 614: Pater eccum advenit peregre non multo prius
Illius: is tibi et faenus et sortem dabit:
Ne inconciliare quid nos porro postules.
Vide *num moratur*.[50]

Rud. 948: Vide, nu<m qui>spiam consequitur prope nos.[51]

Ter. Andr. 878: Vide num eius color pudoris signum usquam indicat.[52]

[48] *estne* codd., Lindsay: *sitne* Pylades, Leo, Goetz-Schoell. Gaffiot's interpretation (*Rev. de phil.*, XXVIII, p. 49) that the question is direct seems to me forced.

[49] This is the punctuation of Leo and Lindsay. Goetz-Schoell, and likewise Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.*, XXVIII, p. 51, regard the question as direct. Gaffiot concedes that on this interpretation *estne ibi* is absurd, because the person addressed cannot have gone to the temple. However, he argues, "c' est précisément dans cette absurdité que réside tout le sel . . ;" for the person at whom the joke is aimed is a soldier, of whom Plautus, as is his practice, makes "un balourd inintelligent," incapable even of seeing that he is being openly ridiculed. Gaffiot's interpretation seems to me very improbable.

[50] This is the punctuation of Lindsay, Goetz-Schoell, and Leo.

[51] This is the punctuation of Lindsay, Goetz-Schoell, and Leo.

[52] This is the punctuation of Tyrrell and of Dziatzko (Leipzig, 1884). Fairclough has *?*.

VII. Concern

1. Quid.

Cic. Att. V 20, 7: At te Romae non fore! Sed est totum quid Kalendis Martiis futurum est.[53]

VIII. Wonder

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Plaut. M. G. 377: Nimis mirumst facinus quo modo haec hinc huc transire potuit.

M. G. 418: Sed facinus mirum est quo modo haec hinc huc transire potuit.[54]

14. Qui (Adverb).

Plaut. Epid. 414: Mirum hoc qui potuit fieri.[55]

15. Quo.

Plaut. Stich. 541: Miror quo evasurust apologus.[56]

4. *Indications that Questions are Indirect, rather than Directly Quoted.* (1) When one and the same verb introduces both a question which may conceivably be either directly or indirectly quoted, and also a question which *must* be indirectly quoted, it is most natural to consider the former question as of the same kind as the latter. Thus, in Cic. Inv. I 28, 43 (cited p. 27) "In hac eae res quaeruntur," is followed, first by subjunctive indirect questions, and then by "postea homines id sua auctoritate comprobare an offendere in iis consuerunt." The natural interpretation, it seems to me, is that this indicative question is, like the subjunctive questions preceding it, indirectly quoted. To be sure, a shift from indirect to direct quotation is conceivable.[57]

[53] Thus Gaffiot, *Pour le vrai latin* (Paris, 1909) 71, with the codd.: edd. "emend." It would perhaps be possible, though not natural, to interpret: "But the all-important question is: What is going to happen on the first of March?"

[54] Becker's interpretation (p. 312) of these two examples as relative clauses seems to me even more forced than the interpretation that they are direct questions.

[55] *hoc qui* J F Pylades: *hoc quod*B: *hoc quidem* Z.

[56] Becker, p. 311, suggests a change to *quorsum evadat.*

[57] For shifts from indirect to direct quotation, cf. R. Krumbiegel, *De Varroniano Scribendi Genere Quaestiones* (Leipzig, 1892) 53 n. 3.

(2) If, from the context, it seems that the speaker's, or writer's, interest is merely in the content, and not at all in the form, of the question, the question is better regarded as indirectly, than as directly, quoted. E.g., in Plaut. Epid. 438, Cave praeterbitas ullas aedis, quin roges,/Senex hic ubi habitat Periphanes Platenius, the speaker would naturally be interested, not in the exact words in which the question is to be expressed, but merely in the content of the question. The question, is, therefore, more probably indirect than direct.

(3) After the verb *mirari*, it seems more natural to regard a question as indirectly, than as directly, quoted. Catullus 69, 10, Aut admirari desine cur fugiunt, may conceivably be understood to mean: "Or cease to wonder: 'Why do they run away?' " However, it is more naturally interpreted: "Or cease to wonder why they run away."

(4) When a question shows a shift in person, it is natural to understand it as indirect. Instances of such questions are Lucil. 375 and Cic. Att. VIII 11, 5, cited below. It might be thought that a shift in person proves conclusively that a question is indirect. It is, however, conceivable that a clause like the ones cited may be a mixture of direct and indirect quotation. In English, for example, there occur expressions like "As for your question, what did Smith write to me?" In this expression the use of the person is appropriate to indirect quotation; but the position of the verb, its form—"did write" for "wrote"—,the more expressive delivery of the quotation, and the longer pause before it are appropriate to direct quotation.[58] Similarly, it is conceivable that in "Quod quaeris, quid Caesar ad me scripsit" (Att. VIII 11, 5) "ad me" belongs to indirect quotation but the mood-use is due to the question's being felt, in some degree, as direct. However, this explanation seems somewhat forced.

[58] An instance of such mixture of direct and indirect quotation is the following passage from Scott, *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, Chap. 41: "But when was she to see Butler? was a question she could not forbear asking herself."

5. Examples of Questions More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect, than as Directly Quoted.

I. Ask

1. Quid.

Ter. H. T. 1008: At si rogem iam quid est quod peccem aut quam ob rem hoc facias, nescias,
In qua re nunc tam confidenter restas, stulta.[59]

Cic. Att. VIII 11, 5: Quod quaeris, quid Caesar ad me scripsit, quod saepe, gratissimum sibi esse quod quierim.[60]

Vitruv. II 6, 4: Relinquetur desideratio, quoniam item sunt in Etruria ex aqua calida crebri fontes, quid ita non etiam ibi nascitur pulvis.

4. Quae, etc.

Cic. Tusc. I 13, 29: Si vero scrutari vetera et ex iis ea quae scriptores Graeciae prodiderunt, eruere coner, ipsi illi maiorum gentium di qui habentur, hinc a nobis profecti in caelum reperientur. Quaere *quorum demonstrantur* sepulcra in Graecia, reminiscere, quoniam es initiatus, quae tradantur mysteriis; tum denique quam hoc late pateat, intelleges.[61]

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Varro, Excerpta ex Augustini Libro qui est de Dialectica (Goetz-Schoell, Varro, De Lingua Latina, p. 341, 21): Scrutatur, ipsum vincire unde dictum sit: dicemus a vi. Vis quare sic appellatur, requiret.

[59] Becker, p. 183 note, interprets "quid . . . facias" as a directly quoted question.

[60] *scripsit* M, Gaffiot (*Pour le vrai latin* 68): *scripserit* vulg.; *scripserit, scripsit* Tyrrell-Purser. Cf. above, criterion 4.

[61] *demonstrantur* R B O: *demonstrentur* Augustine, de Cons. Evang. I 23, and (changed by the same hand to *demonstrantur*) G, and edd.

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Varro, Reliquorum de Grammatica Librorum Fragmenta 68; Goetz-Schoell, p. 207; Keil G. L. VII 150, 10; Isid. I 27, 15:

Lacrumae an lacrimae, maxumus an maximus et si qua similia sunt quomodo scribi debent quaesitum est.[62]

20. Ubi.

Plaut. Epid. 438:

Cave praeterbitas ullas aedis, quin roges,
Senex hic ubi habitat Periphanes Platenius.[63]

24. -Ne.

Lucil. 375 (Vel. Long. G. L. VII p. 62, 1 K.):

Atque accurrere scribes
Dne an c non est quod quaeras eque labores.[64]

27. An.

Cic. Inv. I 28, 43:

In hac eae res quaeruntur . . . [subjunctive indirect questions]; postea homines id sua auctoritate comprobare *an* offendere in iis *consuerunt;* et cetera, quae factum aliquid similiter confestim aut ex intervallo solent consequi.[65]

[62] *debeant* Carrio, edd.

[63] Becker's interpretation (p. 311) that the clause is relative, with *locum* understood, seems to me impossible. *Rogo* is never used, so far as I can find, with a direct object of the thing inquired about. Indeed Becker himself is not wholly satisfied with his interpretation; for he remarks, *l.c.*, n. 3: "Praeterea nescio an . . . *habitet* vel *habeat* scribendum sit."

[64] *scribas* Dousa, Marx. This is apparently an indirect deliberative question. Cf. p. 12 n. 11.

[65] Editors *consuerint* or *consueverint.* Müller n. cr.: "*consuerunt* H P; *consueverunt* S; *consueverint* H^2." Halm-Bai., n. cr.: "*consuerint* A T; *consuerunt* P; *consueverint* V R E."

VIII. Wonder

13. Cur.

Lucr. IV 290: Quare etiam atque etiam minime mirarier est par,
Illic quor reddunt speculorum ex aequore visum,
Aeribus binis quoniam res confit utraque.[66]

Catull. 69, 10: Quare aut crudelem nasorum interfice pestem,
Aut admirari desine cur fugiunt.[67]

[66] *Illic quor reddant* edd.: *Illis quae reddunt* O Q.

[67] *cum* Froehlich. *frigiunt* O: *fugiant* A.

It would seem to me even more harsh to interpret these *cur*-clauses as relative clauses than to consider them directly quoted questions.

CHAPTER III

Indeterminate Examples: Indirect Questions or Exclamations[1]

I. Clauses whose Interpretation is Indifferent

Exclamations are often identical in form[2] with questions, both with direct and with indirect[3] questions. The clause "Quid ille facit," for example, may be an instance of any one of these three construc-

[1] The objection may be raised, that for the clauses studied in this chapter, the alternative interpretations are, not indirect question and exclamation, but dependent and independent exclamation. The point is not an important one, as far as this study is concerned. It would not affect our conclusions, if this subdivision were called, "Examples Which May be either Dependent or Independent Exclamations." I have chosen the phraseology, "Indirect Questions or Exclamations" for the reason that I do not think that a dependent clause can ever be properly called an exclamation, except when it is a quotation of some one's speech or thought. An example of an indirectly quoted exclamation is Virgil, Aeneid, I 454:

> "Namque sub ingenti lustrat dum singula templo
> Reginam opperiens, dum *quae fortuna sit* urbi
> Artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem
> Miratur, videt Iliacas ex ordine pugnas."

The examples cited in this chapter are of a quite different character. Consider, e.g., Plaut. Stich. 410, Videte, quaeso, quid potest pecunia. If the *quid*-clause is dependent, it is not, it seems to me, an exclamation. The sentence as a whole may be an exclamation, but not the dependent clause in itself. The force of the dependent clause in "Videte, quaeso, quid potest pecunia" is just the same as the force of the dependent clause in "Dicam quid potest pecunia" (an imaginary example). If the latter *quid*-clause is called an indirect question, the former *quid*-clause should be designated by the same name.

[2] In spoken language, to be sure, inflection of the voice, rapidity or slowness of speech, and the length of the pauses between clauses may differentiate the direct question, the indirect question, and the exclamation.

[3] In Latin, which makes no distinction in word-order between direct and indirect questions (cf. p. 91), a particular exclamation is often identical in form both with the direct and with the indirect question. In some languages exclamations resemble at times direct questions and at times indirect ones. For the former kind of exclamation, cf. French, *Avons-nous ri!;* German, *Wie freut sie sich darauf!*. For the latter kind, cf.

tions. Often the context will decide the interpretation. At times, however, it is impossible to distinguish between the indirect question and the exclamation.

I have punctuated the following examples as indirect questions. However, they might equally well be punctuated as exclamations.

VI. See

4. Quae, etc.

Ter. Eun. 242: Viden me ex eodem ortum loco,
Qui color, nitor, vestitus, quae habitudost corporis?
Omnia habeo neque quicquam habeo.[4]

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Plaut. M. G. 201: Illuc sis vide,
Quem ad modum astitit, severo fronte curans, cogitans.

19. Quam.

Plaut. Capt. 557: Viden tu hunc, quam inimico uoltu intuitur?

23. Ut.

Plaut. Men. 828: Viden tu illic oculos virere? Ut viridis exoritur colos
Ex temporibus atque fronte, ut oculi scintillant, vide.

30. Various Connectives.

Plaut. Most. 830: Specta quam arte dormiunt.
Th. Dormiunt? *Tr.* Illud quidem ut conivent uolui dicere.

French, *Combien de pommes vous avez là!;* German, *Wie schön diese Aussicht ist!;* English, *How beautiful this view is!*

Just how the exclamation is related historically to the other constructions is not certain. Paul, *Prinzipien*, 123, thinks of exclamations as rhetorical direct questions. Brugmann, on the other hand, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*, 942, shows how exclamations may develop from *indirect* questions.

[4] Tyrrell begins a new sentence with *qui*, and places ! after corporis.

II. Clauses Which, if an Indicative Indirect Question Exists, are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Exclamations

1. *Indications that Clauses are Indirect Questions rather than Exclamations.* There are a number of examples of clauses which may be exclamations but are most naturally interpreted as indirect questions. The reasons why the interpretation of these clauses as indirect questions seems the most natural one are not always easy to formulate. There are, however, a number of circumstances which may be pointed to as favoring the interpretation that the clauses are indirect questions. These circumstances are in part identical with those which were found to favor the interpretation of questions as indirect rather than as direct (cf. pp. 10 ff.).

Thus, (1) if the clause under consideration intervenes between a question and the answer to it, the clause is probably dependent. Cf. Plaut., As. 884: *Pa.* Audin quid ait? *Ar.* Audio. One might perhaps object that, in such an instance, the clause is a dependent *exclamation*, rather than a dependent *question*. But there is no such thing, except in quotations, as a dependent exclamation that is distinct from a dependent question (cf. p. 29, n. 1.).

(2) When there is a close logical connection between the passage under debate and a preceding sentence, it sometimes yields the smoothest and most natural Latin, to regard the clause under consideration as dependent, and hence an indirect question. Cf. Plaut., Stich. 310: Nimis haec res sine cura geritur: vide quam dudum hic asto et pulto. Here the words that follow the colon confirm the statement that precedes it. This confirmation is most smoothly and naturally made if *vide* is the principal verb and the *quam*-clause is dependent.

(3) The fact that the introductory verb is modified by an adverb or a phrase may make it more natural to understand the clause under consideration as dependent, and an indirect question, than as independent, and an exclamation. Cf. Sil. Ital., XIII 446: Interea cerne, ut gressus inhumata citatos Fert umbra et properat tecum coniungere dicta.[5]

[5] This example, from Part II, is cited here, because there is no good illustration of the principle among the earlier examples.

(4) The occurrence, next to the clause under consideration, of a clear example of an indirect question, to which it seems to be connected by a coordinating conjunction, favors the interpretation of the clause as an indirect question. Cf. Ter. Andr. 650: Ah, nescis quantis in malis uorser miser/Quantasque hic consiliis suis mihi conflavit sollicitudines/Meus carnufex.

(5) The meaning of some verbs makes it less natural for them to be followed by an exclamation than by an indirect question. The verb *memini* is an example. Cf. Cic. Lael. 25, 96: Atque, ut ad me redeam, meministis, Q. Maxumo . . . et L. Mancino consulibus, quam popularis lex de sacerdotiis C. Licini Crassi videbatur.

These five criteria correspond, in a general way, to the first, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth criteria on pp. 10 ff. There are a few additional circumstances which favor the interpretation of clauses as indirect questions rather than as exclamations.

(6) With an introductory verb that is not in the imperative mood, it is generally more natural to utter an indirect question than an exclamation. Conversely, it is more natural to interpret an indeterminate clause used with such a verb, as an indirect question than as an exclamation. Cf. Plaut. Capt. 592: Heus, audin quid ait? (Cited more fully, p. 35.)

(7) In a passage that is calmly intellectual in tone, an exclamation would be out of place. An example is Virg. Georg. I 57: Nonne vides croceos ut Tmolus odores,/India mittit ebur, molles sua tura Sabaei,/At Chalybes nudi ferrum. . . .?

(8) The content of a clause is sometimes of a kind with which, in the context in which the clause occurs, exclamatory feeling does not harmonize. Cf. Plaut. Pseud. 330: *Ba.* Nolo victumas: agninis me extis placari uolo. *Cali.* Propera, quid stas? I accerse agnos. Audin quid ait Iuppiter? In this context, *quid ait Iuppiter* cannot well have any exclamatory tone. The clause is, in all probability, an indirect question.

(9) Sometimes the structure of the clause under consideration opposes the interpretation of the clause as an exclamation. So in Plaut. As. 636, Videtin viginti minas quid pollent quidve possunt, the conjunction *-ve* is indicative of reflection, and, while it is conceivable that it should be used after an exclamation, its occurrence is

more natural on the assumption that *quid pollent* is an indirect question.

2. *Examples of Clauses More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Exclamations.*[6]

II. Inform

19. Quam.

Ter. Hec. 472: Idque si nunc memorare hic velim,
Quam fideli animo et benigno in illam et clementi fui,
Vere possum, ni te ex ipsa haec magis velim resciscere.[7]

IIIB. Observe

1. Quid.

Plaut. Men. 472: Observa quid dabo.[8]

19. Quam.

Plaut. Amph. 507: Observatote, quam blande mulieri palpabitur.[9]

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

10. Quantus, etc.

Cato Orig. Fr. 95b (Ex Libro V) (Peter ed. 1914, p. 86): Cogitate *quanto* nos inter nos privatim cautius *facimus*. Nam unus quisque nostrum, siquis aduorsus rem suam quid fieri arbitratur, summa vi contra nititur, ne aduorsus eam fiat: quod illi tamen perpessi.[10]

[6] The clauses cited in this section vary greatly as regards the degree in which it is more natural to interpret them as indirect questions. Some of them may almost as well be understood as exclamations. Others are almost certainly indirect questions.

[7] It would be unnatural, but perhaps not wholly impossible, to regard the *quam*-clause as a directly quoted exclamation, in apposition with *id*: "Quam fideli animo . . . fui!"

[8] Thus B C D, Leo, Goetz-Schoell: *observabo quid agat* F Z.

[9] *Cum blande suppalpatur mulieri* schol. Virg. Aen. II 725: *ut blande palpetur mulieri* Donatus Adel. Prol. 2.

[10] Becker, p. 301, would read *faciamus*.

19. Quam.

Ter. H. T. 638: Quam bene vero abs te prospectumst quid uoluisti cogita:
Nempe anui illi prodita abs te filiast planissume,
Per te vel uti quaestum faceret vel uti veniret palam.[11]

IV. Know

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Trin. 283: Novi ego hoc saeculum moribus quibus est.[12]

10. Quantus, etc.

Plaut. M. G. 1075: Non edepol tu scis, mulier,
Quantum ego honorem nunc illi habeo.[13]

Ter. Andr. 650: Ah nescis quantis in malis uorser miser
Quantasque hic consiliis suis mihi conflavit sollicitudines
Meus carnufex.[14]

19. Quam.

Cic. Lael. 25, 96: Atque, ut ad me redeam, meministis, Q. Maxumo . . . et L. Mancino consulibus, *quam* popularis lex de sacerdotiis C. Licini Crassi *videbatur*: cooptatio enim collegiorum ad populi beneficium transferebatur. . . . Tamen illius vendibilem orationem religio deorum immortalium nobis defendentibus facile vincebat.[15]

[11] *quid* codd., Dziatzko: *quod* Bothe, Tyrrell.

Becker, p. 302, is troubled by this example, and would emend it.

[12] *siet* P: *et* A. Studemund, *Rheinisches Museum* XXI (1866) 593: "Der Codex hat deutlich *quibuset* was wohl weniger auf 'quibus siet' als auf 'quibus est' hinzeigt."

[13] Becker, p. 219, suggests a change to *habeam*. It would be extremely forced, indeed practically impossible, to interpret the *quantum*-clause as an exclamation.

[14] Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.*, XXVIII p. 54, interprets the indicative clause as an exclamation. Becker's interpretation (p. 219) is similar.

[15] This is the punctuation of Halm-Baiter. Baiter-Kayser and Müller place *!* after *videbatur*. The latter punctuation seems to me less natural.

23. Ut.

Plaut. Bacch. 202: Vide, quaeso, ne quis tractet illam indiligens:
Scis tu ut confringi vas cito Samium solet.[16]

Most. 149: Cor dolet quom scio ut nunc sum atque ut fui.[17]

V. Hear

1. Quid.

Plaut. As. 884: *Pa.* Audin quid ait? *Art.* Audio.[18]

Capt. 592: Heus, audin quid ait? quin fugis?
Iam illic hic nos insectabit lapidibus, nisi illunc iubes
Comprehendi.

Pers. 655: *Vi.* Iam hoc tibi dico: actutum ecastor meus pater, ubi me sciet
Veniisse, ipse aderit et me abs te redimet. *To.* Quid nunc? *Do.* Quid est?
To. Audin quid ait?

Pseud. 330: *Ba.* Nolo victimas: agninis me extis placari uolo.
Ca. Propera: quid stas? I accerse agnos. Audin quid ait Iuppiter?

Ter. Eun. 1037: Audin tu, hic quid ait?[19]

[16] Becker, p. 254, suggests a change to "Scin tu? confringi" or the like.

[17] It would be so forced as to be practically impossible, to interpret the *ut*-clauses in these two examples as exclamations: the former, "You know this: How quickly Samian ware is smashed!"; the latter, "It grieves me to think about it: what sort of person I am, and what sort I have been!" Becker's interpretation (p. 310) of the latter example as a relative clause is quite impossible: "Mente supple fere: Scio me talem, ut. . . ."

[18] Becker, pp. 271 ff., thinks that *audin* has no real interrogative force and that the question is not really dependent. However (p. 285), he acknowledges that in Ter. Heaut. 731 a reply, *Audivi*—which corresponds to *audio* in this example—shows that the preceding *audisti*—which corresponds to *audin* in this example—is a real question, and that the following interrogative clause is dependent. Cf., against Becker, Morris, "On the Sentence Question in Plautus and Terence," *A.J.P.* X (1889) pp. 404 ff. Becker's interpretation is, to say the least, extremely unnatural.

[19] Becker's explanation, pp. 271 ff., that these examples are exclamations—"exclamationes interrogationum formam indutae"—is forced. In all these passages the natural interpretation is that the *quid*-clauses are indirect questions. For Pseud., 330, particularly, an exclamation would be out of harmony with the context. Cf. p. 32, criterion 8.

23. Ut.

Plaut. As. 598: Audin hunc opera ut largus est nocturna?

Men. 919: Audin tu ut deliramenta loquitur?

Enn. ap. Non., p. 150, 6 (Annales VI; Vahlen 210):

Divi hoc audite parumper,
Ut pro Romano populo prognariter armis
Certando prudens animam de corpore mitto.

VI. See

1. Quid.

Plaut. As. 636: Videtin viginti minae quid pollent quidve possunt?[20]

Pers. 292: Specta
Quid dedero. *Pa.* Nihil, nam nihil habes.

Stich. 410: Videte, quaeso, quid potest pecunia.

Trin. 847: Viden egestas quid negoti dat homini misero mali?

Ter. Eun. 265: Viden otium et cibus quid facit alienus?[21]

Phor. 358: Quia egens relictast misera, ignoratur parens,
Neclegitur ipsa: vide avaritia quid facit.

Cic. Att. XIII 18, 1: Vides propinquitas quid habet.[22]

Caecil. Statius, Ribbeck II, p. 71, 216: Vide, Demea, hominis quid fert morum similitas.[23]

Prop. II 16, 29: Aspice quid donis Eriphyla invenit amaris,
Arserit et quantis nupta Creusa malis.[24]

[20] It is only by extremely forced interpretations that this example, and also some of the examples cited below, can be interpreted as anything else than indirect questions. Becker, p. 272, considers that *viden* and the like are imperative in effect, and that the clauses following are exclamations. Becker's interpretation is opposed by Morris in *A.J.P.*, X (1889), pp. 404 ff.

[21] *faciat* A (according to Fabia, ed. Paris, 1895).

[22] *habet* M, Gaffiot (*Pour le vrai latin*, 71): *habeat* Lambinus, Müller, and other edd.

[23] *fert* edd.: *feret* codd.

[24] Cf. p. 32, criterion 4.

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Most. 199: Postremo, si dictis nequis perduci ut vera haec credas
Mea dicta, ex factis nosce rem. Vides quae sim et quae fui ante.[25]

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Pers. 386: Tace, stulta, non tu nunc hominum mores vides,
Quoiius modi hic cum mala fama facile nubitur?
Dum dos sit nullum vitium vitio uortitur.[26]

10. Quantus, etc.

Ter. Phorm. 987: Os opprime inpurum: vide
Quantum valet.

15. Quo.

Ter. Eun. 238: Quoniam miser quod habui perdidi, en
Quo redactus sum. Omnes noti me atque amici deserunt.[27]

19. Quam.

Plaut. Stich. 310: Nimis haec res sine cura geritur: vide quam dudum hic asto et pulto.

Ter. Hec. 223: At vide quam immerito aegritudo haec oritur mi abs te, Sostrata:
Rus habitatum abii, concedens vobis et rei serviens,
Sumptus vostros otiumque ut nostra res posset pati.[28]

Cic. Att. VIII 13, 2: Et vide quam conversa res est: illum quo antea confidebant metuunt, hunc amant quem timebant.[29]

[25] Leo and Goetz-Schoell, following Seyffert, place : after *sim.* Probably they think of *quae fui ante* as exclamatory, though they do not punctuate with an exclamation-point. Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.*, XXVIII, p. 53, interprets the clause as an exclamation. Becker, p. 297, takes it as an indirect question and proposes a change to *fuerim.*

[26] cuiusmodi A: quoius modi B: quo vis modi C D: quoiuismodi Lorenzius (duce Guy.), Leo, Goetz-Schoell. Mala del. Camerarius.

[27] For *en*, *hem*, etc., with indirect questions in the *subjunctive*, cf. Gutsche *De Interrogationibus Obliquis apud Ciceronem Observationes Selectae* (Halle, 1885) p. 99, n. 1.

[28] Becker, p. 296, would change to *oriatur.*

[29] *sit* Mue. and other edd.: *est* codd., Tyrrell.

Att. X 12 A, 2: In quo si quod σφάλμα, vides quam turpe est.[30]

De Orat. II 42, 180: Paulum, inquit Catulus, etiam nunc deesse videtur iis rebus, Antoni, quas exposuisti, quod sit tibi ante explicandum, quam illuc proficiscare, quo te dicis intendere. Quidnam? inquit. Qui ordo tibi placeat, inquit Catulus, et quae dispositio argumentorum, in qua tu mihi semper deus videri soles. Vide *quam sum*, inquit, deus in isto genere, Catule. Non hercule mihi nisi admonito venisset in mentem.[31]

Sall. Jug. 85, 25: Nunc videte quam iniqui sunt.[32]

Lucr. IV 1204: Nonne vides etiam quos mutua saepe voluptas
Vinxit, ut in vinclis communibus excrucientur?
In trivilis *quam* saepe canes, discedere aventis,
Divorsi cupide summis ex viribus *tendunt*,
Cum interea validis Veneris compagibus haerent?
Quod facerent numquam nisi mutua gaudia nossent.[33]

Prop. I 17, 6: Quin etiam absenti prosunt tibi, Cynthia, venti:
Aspice quam saevas increpat aura minas.[34]

23. Ut.

The examples with *ut* are arranged in two groups. The second group comprises the clauses which follow *ecce* or an imperative. The first group comprises the remaining examples.

Group I

Plaut. Bacch. 492: Viden ut aegre patitur gnatum esse corruptum tuom,
Suom sodalem, ut ipsus sese cruciat aegritudine?

[30] *Est* M, Mue. (with †), Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.*, XXVIII, p. 53: *sit* Baiter, Boot, Tyrrell-Purser. It would be extremely forced to interpret the *quam*-clause in this example otherwise than as an indirect question.

[31] *sum* M: *sim* the other codd., edd.

[32] *sunt* G P g^1 γ: *sint* M M^1 T F s^2 edd.

[33] 1203 *quam* Lachmann, edd., for *cum*. 1204 is 1210 in codd., changed by Nauger. Munro and other edd. place *l* after 1205.

[34] increpet D V.

Bacch. 1130: Viden limulis, obsecro, ut intuentur?[35]

Cist. 26: Decet pol, mea Selenium,
Hunc esse ordinem beniuolentis inter se
Beneque amicitia utier,
Ubi istas videas summo genere gnatas, summatis matronas,
Ut amicitiam *colunt* atque *ut* eam iunctam bene *habent* inter se.

Curc. 93: Viden ut aperiuntur aedes festivissumae?
Num muttit cardo? Est lepidus.[36]

Curc. 160: Viden ut anus tremula medicinam facit?

Curc. 188: Viden ut misere moliuntur? Nequeunt complecti satis.

Curc. 311: Viden ut expalluit: datin isti sellam ubi assidat cito
Et aqualem cum aqua? properatin ocius?

Men. 181: Oh! solem vides
Satin ut occaecatust prae huius corporis candoribus?

Men. 646: Viden ut te scelestus captat?[37]

Merc. 880: Caelum ut est splendore plenum† ex adverso vides.[38]

M. G. 1045: Viden tu ignauom ut sese infert?[39]

Most. 811: Non tu vides hunc uoltu uti tristi est senex?[40]

Most. 1172: Mitte, quaeso, istum. †*Th.* Viden ut restat furcifer?

Pers. 812: Viden ut tuis dictis pareo?

Rud 171: Viden alteram illam ut fluctus eiecit foras?

Rud. 869: *La.* Viden me ut rapior? *Ch.* Video atque inspecto lubens.[41]

[35] intuent C D^1.

[36] Goetz-Schoell puts *?* after *viden*, and, with Bentley, brackets *ut*.

[37] *vident* some codd. *te* add. Lambinus. *captat* Camerarius, edd.: *capiat* codd.

[38] Edd. insert *non* or *nonne*.

[39] *infert* Acidalius, edd.: *inferat* or *inferant* codd.

[40] Becker, p. 287, would either begin a new sentence with *uoltu* or read *sit* in place of *est*.

[41] The fact that the *ut*-clause intervenes between question and answer strongly favors the interpretation of that clause as an indirect question.

Stich. 635: Vides ut annonast gravis.
Viden benignitates hominum ut periere et prothymiae?[42]

Accius, Ribbeck I p. 176, 303: Viden ut te inpietas stimulat nec moderat metus?[43]

Turpilius, Ribbeck II p. 98, 103: Viden ut fastidit mei?[44]

Turpilius, Ribbeck II p. 98, 104: Ei perii! Viden ut osculatur cariem? Num hilum illa haec pudet?

Unknown Writer, Ribbeck II, p. 122, 62: Viden ut cinaedus orbem digito temperat?

Afranius, Ribbeck II p. 176, 91: Viden ut facunde contra causaris patrem?[45]

Cic. Deorum Nat. II 44, 113: Hinc autem aspicitur
Ut sese ostendens emergit Scorpios alto
Posteriore trahens plexum vi corporis arcum.[46]

Catull. 61, 78: Viden ut faces
Splendidas quatiunt comas?

Catull. 62, 8: Viden ut perniciter exsiluere?

Virg. Culex 217: Viden ut flagrantia taedis
Lumina collucent?[47]

Georg. I 57: Nonne vides croceos *ut* Tmolus odores,
India *mittit* ebur, molles sua tura Sabaei,
At Chalybes nudi ferrum, virosaque Pontus
Castorea, Eliadum palmas, Epiros equarum?[48]

[42] 635 *vides* codd., including A: *viden* Fl. 636 *v(ide)n* A: *vides* P. *ut perierint* A^1 ("*ut* del. A^2," says Lindsay): *periere* P, Lindsay: *ut periere* other edd.

[43] *vident ut* Bamb.

[44] *viden ut* Fr. Dousa: *vide nunc* codd.

[45] *viden* (an *video?*) *ut* Ribbeck: *videt* codd.: *vide ut* Bentinus: *iudex* Buecheler.

[46] It would be extremely forced to interpret this *ut*-clause as an exclamation.

[47] Thus Leo: *lumina cum lucent* cod.

[48] *Mittet* P^1: *mittat* M^2C: Seneca Ep. Mor. LXXXVII 17 quotes this passage with *mittat*.

Aen. VI 779: Viden ut geminae stant vertice cristae
Et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore?[49]

Group II

In this group the clauses under consideration are used with an imperative or *ecce*. The examples in which the clauses are explanatory of pronouns, (*hoc* and the like) are given after the other examples.

Plaut. Cas. 246: Vide palliolum ut rugat.
Most. 855: Quin tu illam aspice ut placide accubat.
Most. 887: Vide ut fastidit simia.
Truc. 354: Ver vide,
Ut tota floret, ut olet, ut nitide nitet.[50]
Ter. Adel 559: Em, vide ut discidit labrum.
Eun. 919: Virum bonum eccum Parmenonem incedere
Video: vide ut otiosus it.
Catull. 61, 99: Vide ut faces
Aureas quatiunt comas:[51]
Catull. 62, 12: Adspicite, innuptae secum ut meditata requirunt.
Laberius, Ribbeck II, p. 295, 104: Quem nulla ambitio, nulla umquam largitio,
Nullus timor, vis nulla, nulla auctoritas
Movere potuit in iuventa de statu:
Ecce in senecta *ut* facile *labefecit* loco
Viri excellentis mente clemente edita
Summissa placide blandiloquens oratio!
Virg. Ecl. IV 52: Aspice convexo nutantem pondere mundum,
Terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum:
Aspice venturo laetantur ut omnia saeclo.[52]
Ecl. V 7: Aspice ut antrum
Silvestris raris sparsit labrusca racemis.

[49] *stent* many codd. and former edd. Cf. Heyne's note.
[50] Lindsay puts / after 354.
[51] *vide ut faces* or *viden? faces* edd.: *viden ut faces* codd.
[52] *laetantur* R, Wagn. Haupt.: *laetentur* Pγ. b c Güthling Ribbeck.

Aen. VI 856: Aspice ut insignis spoliis Marcellus opimis
Ingreditur, victorque viros supereminet omnes.

Aen. VIII 192: Iam primum saxis suspensam hanc adspice rupem,
Disiectae procul ut moles desertaque montis
Stat domus et scopuli ingentem traxere ruinam.

In the following examples, the clauses under consideration fill out pronouns (*hoc* and the like).

Plaut. Cist. 55: Neque munda adaeque es ut soles (hoc sis vide, ut petivit
Suspiritum alte) et pallida's.

Curc. 126: Hoc vide ut ingurgitat inpura in se merum avariter faucibus plenis.

Curc. 153: Hoc vide ut dormiunt pessuli pessumi
Nec mea gratia commovent se ocius.

Merc. 169: *Ch.* Hercle vero vapulabis nisi iam loquere aut hinc abis.
Ac. Hoc sis vide, ut palpatur.

Pseud. 152: Hoc sis vide ut alias res agunt.

Aul. 47: Illuc sis vide,
Ut incedit.

Pseud. 955: Illuc sis vide,
Ut transuorsus, non prouorsus cedit, quasi cancer solet.

Ter. Adel. 229: Illud vide,
Ut in ipso articulo oppressit.

Eun. 670: Illud vide, os ut sibi distorsit carnufex.

30. Various Connectives.

Lucr. VI 811: Nonne vides etiam terra quoque sulpur in ipsa
Gignier et taetro concrescere odore bitumen;
Denique ubi argenti venas aurique secuntur,
Terrai penitus scrutantes abdita ferro,
810 Qualis expiret Scaptensula subter odores?
*Quid*ve mali *fit* ut exhalent aurata metalla?
Quas hominum *reddunt* facies qualisque colores?
Nonne vides audisve perire in tempore parvo

Quam soleant et quam vitai copia desit,
815 Quos opere in tali cohibet vis magna necessis?[53]

IX. It is Incredible

4. Quae, etc.

Cic. Fam. XVI 27, 2: Incredibilest, *quae* ego illos *scio* oppositis Gallorum castris in aestivis fecisse, quos ille latro, nisi aliquid firmius fuerit, societate vitiorum deleniet.[54]

10. Quantus, etc.

Ter. Phorm. 247: O Phaedria, incredibilest quantum erum ante eo sapientia.[55]

23. Ut.

Cic. Att. IV 5, 1: Non est credibile, quae sit perfidia in istis principibus, ut volunt esse et ut essent, si quicquam haberent fidei.[56]

[53] The editors place / after 811 and after 812. It seems to me a little more natural to regard *quidve . . . fit* and *quas . . . reddunt* as indirect questions, parallel to *qualis expiret.*

[54] *sciam* Wesenberg.

[55] *est* bracketed by Bentley, with comment: "Si legas *incredibile est*, consequens erit ut *anteeam* legas." Becker (p. 236) and Tyrrell follow Bentley.

[56] In the last three passages it would be very forced to interpret the apparent instances of indirect questions as exclamations.

CHAPTER IV

Indeterminate Examples: Indirect Questions or Relative Clauses

I. Clauses whose Interpretation is Indifferent

1. *Introductory.* The relative clause is, in most of its uses,[1] quite distinct from the indirect question. A relative clause either modifies some particular word or words, expressed or understood, in the main clause, or else it modifies the main clause as a whole.[2] An indirect question, on the other hand, is a direct object[3] or a subject,[4] or else is in apposition with some substantive, usually itself an object or a subject.[5] A relative clause is an adjectival or adverbial clause. An indirect question is a substantive clause.

Frequently, however, the two distinct constructions of the indirect question and the substantive with modifying relative clause, perform practically the same function. Compare, for example, Plaut. Amph. 425, Nam quod egomet solus feci, nec quisquam alius adfuit,/In tabernaclo, id quidem hodie numquam poterit dicere, with Pseud. 696, Id tu modo me quid vis facere fac sciam. If, now, the dependent clause is introduced by a connective that is indeterminate in form —e.g., *cuius*, *quae*[6]—, it may result that the clause itself is indeter-

[1] Just how the two kinds of clauses are related *historically*, is a matter of conjecture. It is not necessary, for our purpose, to discuss the difficult problem of the origin of the Latin relative clause. For theories concerning its origin, cf., e.g., Paetzolt, *De Latini Pronominis Relativi Syntaxi Prisca* 13 ff.; Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, III, 389 ff. (§183); Kroll, *Der lateinische Relativsatz* 1 ff.

[2] Cf. Deecke, *De Usu Pronominis Relativi apud Poetas Veteres Latinos Quaestiones Syntacticae* (Göttingen, 1907), 54.

[3] E.g., Plaut. Poen 1111: Sed earum nutrix qua sit facie, mi expedi.

[4] E.g., Cic. Att. XV, I, 1: Incredibilest quanta me molestia affecerit.

[5] E.g., Plaut. Curc. 396: Nam quid id refert mea, an aula quassa cum cinere effossus siet?; Capt. 407: Haec pater quando sciet, Tyndare, ut fueris animatus erga suom gnatum atque se, Numquam erit tam avarus quin te gratiis emittat manu.

[6] There is no differentiation in form between the interrogative and the relative pronoun, except in the substantive uses of the masculine nominative singular (*quis*, *qui*) and of the neuter nominative and accusative singular (*quid*, *quod*). See Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg, 1914) 434 ff.; also Appendix III of this study. Moreover, there is a large number of other words which have both relative and interrogative uses (e.g., *ubi*, *ut*).

minate, i.e., that it may be interpreted either as relative or as interrogative. Cf. Most. 505: Quae hic monstra fiunt, anno vix possum eloqui.

2. *Examples of Clauses whose Interpretation is Indifferent.* There are numerous examples in which it is impossible to distinguish between the indirect question and the relative clause. Illustrations follow.

II. Inform

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Amph. 50: Nunc quam rem oratum huc veni, primum proloquar.

Amph. 133: Quae illi ad legionem facta sunt, memorat pater Meus Alcumenae.

Amph. 417: *So.* Egomet mihi non credo, quom illaec autumare illum audio:
Hic quidem certe quae illic sunt res gestae memorat memoriter.

Capt. 360: Nunc tu illum si illo's missurus, dice monstra praecipe,
Quae ad patrem vis nuntiari.

Capt. 416: Si ego item memorem quae me erga multa fecisti bene,
Nox diem adimat.

Most. 505: Quae hic monstra fiunt, anno vix possum eloqui.

Poen. 556: Sed agite igitur, ut sciam uos scire rem,
Expedite mihi quae vobis dudum dixi dicite.

Accius, Ribbeck I p. 192, 432: Neque ratum est quod dicas, neque quae[7] agitas dicendi est locus.

Ter. Adel. 604: Sed si aliter putas,
Egomet narrabo quae mihi dixti. *Mi.* Immo ego ibo.

Hec. 362: Nequeo mearum rerum initium ullum invenire idoneum,
Unde exordiar narrare quae necopinanti accidunt;

[7] agitas dicendi est locus. Ribbeck, following Voss, inserts *ea* before *quae*.

Partim quae perspexi hisce oculis, partim percepi auribus.

Cic. Verr. Act. II, II 73, 179: Meminero . . . me Siculis satis esse facturum, si quae cognovi in Sicilia, quae accepi ab ipsis, diligenter exposuero.

Verr. Act. II, IV, 60, 135: Longum est et non necessarium commemorare quae apud quosque visenda sunt tota Asia et Graecia.[8]

Div. I 38, 82: "Si sunt di neque ante declarant hominibus quae futura sint, aut non diligunt homines, aut quid eventurum sit ignorant, aut existumant nihil interesse hominum scire quid sit futurum, aut non censent esse suae maiestatis praesignificare hominibus *quae sunt futura*, aut ea ne ipsi quidem di significare possunt. . . ."[9]

Div. II 49, 101:[10]

Fam. XII 13, 3: Ibi quae cognovimus scribere ad vos quam celerrime voluimus.

Sulpicius in Cic. Fam. IV 5, 4: Quae res mihi non mediocrem consolationem attulit, volo tibi commemorare, si forte eadem res tibi dolorem minuere possit.[11]

Cic. Quint. Fratr. III 7, 2: Romam cum venero, quae perspexero scribam ad te et maxime de dictatura.

[8] *sint* R, Müller.

[9] *quae sint futura* H. The same quotation occurs II 49, 101, where Müller has n. cr.: "*sunt* scr. ut p. 176, 35 (this passage) et codd. et edd. habent, *sint* per se non intolerabile hic utrique."

[10] See the critical note just above.

[11] Mue. n. cr: "*attulerit* Wesenb., Bait., Andres. Indicativum Servio condonamus." Kroll, Glotta III (1910-12) 6, says that the indicative is defended by Schmalz, *Z.f.g.W.*, 1881, p. 124.

Att. X 16, 2: Tu, dum adsumus, non modo quae scies audierisve, sed etiam quae futura providebis, scribas velim.[12]

Balbus, in Att. IX 7A, 2: A quo si erit nobis rescriptum, statim quae sentiemus, ad te scribemus.[13]

Prop. III 6, 1: Dic mihi de nostra, quae sentis, vera puella.

Ov. Met. XIII 206: Longa referre mora est, quae consilioque manuque
Utiliter feci spatiosi tempore belli.

Other examples from Ovid are Her. IX 122 and X 79; Ex Ponto III 3, 3.

13. Cur.

Lucr. II 765: Perfacile extemplo rationem reddere possis
Cur ea quae nigro fuerint paulo ante colore,
Marmoreo fieri possunt candore repente.[14]

23. Ut.

Plaut. Amph. 599: Ordine omne, ut<i> quicque actumst, dum apud hostis sedimus,
Edissertavit.[15]

Bacch. 1097: Omniaque ut quidque actumst memoravit.

Amph. 1129: Simul hanc rem ut factast eloquar.

As. 731: Nunc rem ut est eloquamur.

These clauses with *ut* are either relative clauses, or indirect questions of the proleptic or of the pleonastic type. For pleonasm and prolepsis see Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, pp. 72 ff.

III. Find Out

4. Quae, etc.

Ter. Phorm. 737: *So.* Neque ille investigatur, *Ch.* Quid ago?
So. Qui eius pater est. *Ch.* Adeo, maneo, dum haec *quae loquitur* magis cognosco?

[12] *scies* M[1], Wesenberg, Purser: *scieris* M[2], Baiter, Boot, Tyrrell.

[13] *quae sentiemus* M[2], Baiter, Boot, Tyrrell: *cum sentiamus* M[1]: *quid sentiamus* Wesenb.

[14] *possunt* codd.: *possint* Lambinus, edd.

[15] *ordine omne* or *ordine omnem* codd.

Sall. Jug. 46, 1: Interea Iugurtha, ubi *quae* Metellus *agebat* ex nuntiis accepit, . . . diffidere suis rebus; ac tum demum veram deditionem facere conatus est.

Hor. Ep. I 17, 3: Disce, docendus adhuc quae censet amiculus, ut si
Caecus iter monstrare velit.

Manil. II 435: His animadversis debes, quae proxima cura,
Noscere tutelas adiectaque numina signis,
Et quae quoique deo rerum natura dicavit.[16]

23. Ut.

Plaut. Men. 679: Uxor rescivit rem omnem, ut factumst, ordine.

If this is an example of an indirect question, it shows prolepsis. For prolepsis see Lindsay, *Quaestiones*, pp. 75 ff.

IIIB. Observe

4. Quae, etc.

Q. Cic. De Petit. 9, 35: In salutatoribus . . . hoc efficiendum est, ut hoc ipsum minimum officium eorum tibi gratissimum esse videatur. *Qui* domum tuam *venient*, significato te animadvertere; eorum amicis, qui illis renuntient, ostendito, saepe ipsis dicito.[17]

10. Quantus, etc.

Varro, R. R. I 44, 1: Seruntur fabae modii IV in iugero . . ., sed non nullis locis paulo amplius aut minus. Si enim locus crassus, plus; si macer, minus. Quare observabis *quantum* in ea regione consuetudo *erit* serendi, ut tantum facias; quod tantum valet regio ac genus terrae, ut ex eodem semine aliubi cum decimo redeat aliubi cum quinto decimo, ut in Etruria locis aliquot.[18]

[16] See the critical note in Garrod.

[17] Mue. n. cr: "*veniant* Rob. Steph. Buechel. nescio an non necess. Iis qui venient, significato te adimadvertere eos venire ita, ut vel amicis ostendas vel ipsis dicas; . . . Post veniant add. *iis* dett. codd., Bait., Wesenb."

[18] *quod tantum* Ursinus, Keil, Goetz: *quantum* is the manuscript reading.

Keil explains the *quantum*-clause as relative: "In serendo observandum est ut tantum seras, quantum in ea regione consuetudo est serendi."

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Truc. 931: Venitne in mentem tibi quod verbum in cavea dixit histrio?
Omnes homines ad suom quaestum calent et fastidiunt.

Ter. Hec. 405: Lacrumo, quae posthac futurast vita quom in mentem venit,
Solitudoque.

In this example, it is doubtful whether *quae posthac futurast* is a relative clause modifying *vita*, which is in that case the subject of *venit*, or whether *quae posthac futurast vita solitudoque* is an indirect question, itself the subject of *in mentem venit*.

Q. Cic. De Petit. 1, 3: Et saepe, quae de Demosthenis studio et exercitatione scripsit Demetrius, recordare.

IV. Know

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Cas. 668: *Ly.* Scelestissumum me esse credo.
Par. Immo si scias dicta quae[19] dixit hodie.

M. G. 281: Nescis tu fortasse apud nos facinus quod[19] natumst nouom.

Pacuvius, Ribbeck I p. 132, 407: Nam si qui quae eventura sunt provideant, aequiperent Iovi.[20]

Ter. Hec. 217: An, quia ruri crebro esse soleo, nescire arbitramini
Quo quisque pacto hic vitam uostrarume xigat?
Multo melius hic quae fiunt quam illi ubi sum adsidue scio.

[19] For clear examples of indirect questions with this word-order, cf. Plaut. Aul. 778: Si me nouisti minus, Genere quo sim gnatus; Bacch. 891: Iam dudum hercle equidem sentio, suspicio quae te sollicitet; Curc. 321: Immo si scias reliquiae quae sint. For clear examples of *scire* with a direct object, cf. Poen. 547: Scitis rem; Poen. 553: Scimus rem omnem.

[20] See Ribbeck, *ad loc*, for various "emendations."

Cic. De Orat. II 11, 45: Ex iis enim fontibus, unde . . . dicendi praecepta sumuntur, licebit etiam laudationem ornare neque illa elementa desiderare, quae ut nemo tradat, quis est qui nesciat *quae sunt* in homine laudanda?[21]

Tusc. IV 36, 77: "*A.* Quis homo te exsuperavit usquam gentium impudentia? *M.* Quis autem malitia te? . . ." Nosti quae sequuntur.

Att. XII 2, 1: Habes quae dum tu abes locuti sunt.[22]

For *habere* followed by an indirect question, cf. the subjunctive examples cited by Gaffiot, "(Quis) Quid Relatif," *Revue de Philologie*, XXXIV (1910), pp. 73 ff.

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Plaut. Bacch. 474: Ego omnem rem scio quem ad modumst.[23]

23. Ut.

Plaut. Pseud. 1312: Omnia ut quicque egisti ordine scio.[23a]

V. Hear

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Amph. 977: Audis quae dico,[24] tametsi praesens non ades.

As. 447: *Me.* Perii hercle: iam hic me abegerit suo odio.
Li. Heus iam satis tu:
Audin quae loquitur? *Le.* Audio et quiesco.

Bacch. 273: Porro etiam ausculta pugnam quam voluit dare.

For indirect questions with this word-order, see p. 49, n. 19. An example which might support the interpretation that *pugnam*

[21] *sint* L.

[22] *sunt* M, vulg.: *sint* Σ Lambinus, Mue.

[23] The dependent clause is either a relative clause or an indirect question with prolepsis. For prolepsis cf. Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, pp. 75 ff.

[23a] The *ut*-clause is either a relative clause or an indirect question with pleonasm. For pleonasm cf. Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, pp. 72 ff.

[24] With this example and the succeeding ones, compare the following relative clauses: Plaut. Cas. 165, Ecquis haec quae loquor audit?; Rud. 1129, Audi nunciam, Palaestra atque Ampelisca hoc quod loquor; Lucilius 1032, Hoc etiam accipe quod dico, nam pertinet ad rem.

is the object of *ausculta* and the *quam*-clause is relative, is Epid. 452: Immo si audias Meas pugnas, fugias manibus dimissis domum.

Plaut. Bacch. 698: Immo si audias quae dicta dixit me aduorsum tibi.

Ch. Quid dixit?

Bacch. 861: Audin quae loquitur?

Bacch. 983: Lacrumans tacitus auscultabat quae loquebar.

Capt. 313: Est profecto deus qui quae nos gerimus auditque et videt.

Men. 478: Nequeo quae loquitur exaudire clanculum.

Men. 909: Audin quae loquitur?

M. G. 1222: Audin quae loquitur? *Pa.* Audio.

Pseud. 194: Audin furcifer quae loquitur? Satin magnificus tibi videtur?[25]

Pseud. 230: Pseudole, non audis quae hic loquitur? *Ps.* Audio, ere, equidem atque animum aduorto.

Stich. 197: Quae loquitur auscultabo, prius quam conloquar.

Cic. Att. X 18, 1: Itaque posthac non scribam ad te, quid facturus sim, sed quid fecerim; omnes enim Κωρυκαῖοι videntur subauscultare quae loquor.

VI. See

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Men. 685: Video quam rem agis.
Quia commisi, ut me defrudes, ad eam rem adfectas viam.

Stich. 116: *An.* Ubi facillume spectatur mulier quae ingeniost bono?
Pan. Quoi male faciundist potestas, quae ne id faciat temperat.

For this word-order in indirect questions, see p. 49, n. 19.

Ter. Eun. 783: Viden tu, Thais, quam hic rem agit?

VIIB. Care

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Rud. 782: Ego quae tu loquere flocci non facio, senex.

[25] *quae loquitur* om. A.: Lindsay brackets.

Ter. Hec. 513:

> Postremo inter se transigant ipsi, ut lubet,
> Quando nec gnatus neque hic mi quicquam obtemperant,
> Quae dico parvi pendunt.

VIII. Wonder

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Cic. C. M. 4, 12: Multa in eo viro praeclara cognovi; sed nihil admirabilius quam quo modo ille mortem fili tulit, clari viri et consularis.

This passage is cited by Kroll, *Glotta* III (1910-12), p. 6, as one in which relative clause and indirect question are indistinguishable.

II. Clauses Which, if an Indicative Indirect Question Exists, are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Relative Clauses

1. *Indications that Clauses are Indirect Questions rather than Relative Clauses.* There are a number of circumstances which, in a greater or less degree, favor the interpretation of clauses as indirect questions rather than as relative clauses.

(1) Sometimes the character of the introductory verb renders it unnatural to supply mentally the antecedent that will need to be understood if the clause is relative. Cf. Plaut. Amph. 17: Nunc quoius iussu venio . . . dicam. *Dico*—unlike *mitto*, for example—rarely takes a personal object, and so it is less natural to supply *eum* or *hominem* than to interpret the dependent clause as an indirect question.

(2) Certain relative words are not used, or not freely used, without an expressed antecedent. I can find no sure case of the relative adverb *qui* used in this way. It is natural, therefore, to interpret as interrogative the dependent clause in Plaut. Trin. 165: Quid tibi ego dicam qui illius sapientiam. . . . Paene ille . . . pessum dedit?

The use of the relative pronouns *quo*, *qua*, *unde*, *ubi*, and *cur* without an expressed antecedent is somewhat restricted. The first four

pronouns are freely so used when their antecedents are respectively *eo*, *ea*, *inde*, and *ibi*. Furthermore, there occur combinations like *Hoc est unde*, *Hoc est cur*, *Habeo ubi*, where the logical antecedent is *id*, or *locus*, or *causa*. But such free omission of the antecedent as sometimes occurs in the case of *qui*, *quae*, *quod*, is unheard of for these pronouns. Thus one may say, *Quod hic fecit idem est atque quod ille fecit*; but never, *Cur hoc fecit idem est atque cur illud fecit*, or *Ubi ego fui idem est atque ubi tu fuisti*. In view of the fact that the relatives *quo*, *qua*, *unde*, *ubi*, and *cur* are not freely used without expressed antecedents, it seems reasonable to interpret clauses like the following as indirect questions: Plaut. Trin. 938: Nisi quia lubet experiri quo evasurust denique; Most. 969: Scio qua me eire oportet et quo venerim novi locum; Manil. IV 117: Nec refert scelus unde cadit; Plaut. Aul. 63: Metuo . . . Neu persentiscat aurum ubist absconditum; Cic. Att. XII 40, 3: Si quis requirit cur Romae non sum (codd. vary).

(3) One does not easily supply an antecedent in a case other than the nominative and accusative and other than the case of the pronoun. So in Hor. Serm. II 4, 38, Ignarum quibus est ius aptius (cited p. 68), the *quibus*-clause is most probably an indirect question. Cf. also Apul. Met. V 31, 379 (cited p. 135). The ellipsis of demonstrative pronouns before relative clauses in examples resembling this one, though it occurs, is rare. For its occurrence cf. Bährens, "Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax," *Philologus*, *Supplementband*, XII (1912), pp. 324 f. Cf. also Prescott's review of Helm's edition of Apuleius, Metamorphoses, *Classical Philology*, X (1915), 358.

(4) If the introductory verb requires an object, and the only possible objects are the indeterminate clause—which in this case must be interrogative; cf. p. 44—and some word to be supplied, the former object would seem to be the more available one. Cf. Plaut. Men. 808: *Ma.* Quin etiam nunc habet pallam, pater, Et spinter quod ad hanc detulerat nunc, quia rescivi, refert./*Se.* Iam ego ex hoc ut factumst scibo. It is more natural to interpret, "I shall learn from him what the facts are" (literally, "how it was done"), than, "I shall learn the facts from him, just as they occurred" (literally, "as it was done").

(5) Similarly, if there is a noun or pronoun that requires to be filled out by an appositive, it is more natural to regard the indeter-

minate clause—which in this case must be interrogative—as the appositive, than to supply a noun and consider the indeterminate clause as relative. Cf. Plaut. Most. 1040: Eademque opera haec tibi narravero,/Quis med exemplis hodie eludificatus est. The natural interpretation is that *haec* has, in apposition with it, the entire dependent clause (in this case an indirect question). It would be far less natural to supply *exempla* as the appositive to *haec*, and to interpret: "I will tell you these things: (namely) the ways in which he made sport of me." Cf. also Amph. 442: Certe edepol, quom illum contemplo et formam cognosco meam,/Quem ad modum ego sum . . . nimi' similest mei. It might be possible, but it would not be natural, to supply *modum* as an appositive with *formam* and an antecedent of *quem ad modum*.

(6) The occurrence, in co-ordination with an indeterminate clause, of a certain or probable example of an indirect question, seems to me to favor the interpretation of the indeterminate clause as an indirect question. Cf. Cic. Lael. 15, 55: Etenim cetera cum parant, cui parent nesciunt, nec cuius causa laborant. There do occur examples of an indirect question in co-ordination with a substantive word and modifying relative clause. Cf. Ter. Andria 356: Ausculta paucis; quid ego te velim et tu quod quaeris scies.[26] Therefore, the occurrence, in co-ordination with an indeterminate clause, of a clear example of an indirect question, does not necessitate—though, as it seems to me, it renders natural—the interpretation that the indeterminate clause is an indirect question.

(7) There are clauses which yield a better, that is, a more natural, sense if they are understood as interrogative, while yet they yield a possible sense if they are understood as relative. Cf. Plaut. Pers. 646, Quis fuit? Dic nomen. *Vi.* Quid illum miserum memorem qui fuit?/Nunc et illum Miserum et me Miseram aequomst nominarier. It is far more natural to interpret, "Why should I tell who that poor man was? Now he should be called . . .," than "Why should I tell of that poor man who is dead?" Cf. also Plaut. Most. 459, Non potest/Dici quam indignum facinus fecisti et malum, where

[26] Other examples are given by Draeger, §464. It seems to me that a like co-ordination occurs in Plaut. Rud. 965, At ego quo pacto inventust scio/Et qui invenit hominem novi et dominus qui nunc est scio. However, Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, 73, sees in *qui invenit hominem novi* an indirect question with pleonasm.

the *quam*-clause yields a more natural sense if it is understood as interrogative than if it is understood as relative.[27] There are other examples in which there is less difference between the two interpretations, but in which the interpretation that the dependent clause is interrogative yields a somewhat more natural sense. So for Plaut. Amph. 460, Ibo ad portum atque haec uti sunt facta ero dicam meo, the interpretation, "I will tell how these things were done" is somewhat more natural than, "I will tell these things just as they were done." In the following example it makes still less difference which of the two interpretations is adopted: Cic. C. M. 6, 18, At senatui quae sunt gerenda praescribo.

(8) A clause introduced by (*quis*) *quid* is, when not certainly interrogative, at least more likely to be interrogative than relative. The use of relative (*quis*) *quid* is much more rare than the use of

[27] Becker argues from the existence of clauses of the type of Ter. Hec. 417 (cited below) that clauses of the type of Most. 459 are relative clauses with *tam* or *tantum* understood (pp. 308-9; unfavorably criticized by Kroll, p. 5). While it is conceivable that the clauses of the type of Most. 459 are relative, it seems to me that they are far more probably interrogative. I know of only four examples of the type of Hec. 417. They are:

Ennius, Ribbeck p. 62, 324: Non potis ecfari tantum dictis, quantum factis suppetit.
[*non potis ecfari* Davisius: *non potest ecfari* Brix: *non potest haec fari* Gud. Reg. *tantum* om. Bentley.]

Ter. Hec. 417: Non hercle verbis, Parmeno, dici potest
Tantum quam reapse navigare incommodumst.
[*quantum* for *quam* A. *reapse* Tyrrell: *re ipsa* codd.]

Cic. Att. VI 4, 3: Non queo tantum, quantum vereor, scribere.
[Shuckburgh (London, 1908-09) translates: "I cannot express the extent of my fear."]

Buecheler 709, 12 (CIL V 6728; an inscription in honor of Flavianus, a bishop who is thought to have died in 542):
Tantaque fari nequeo, quanta insunt gratiae opes.

It is to be noted that in every one of these instances the main clause states that it is impossible to express some idea. In other words, the *quantum*-clause depends on a verb of saying which, in its turn, depends upon a phrase that expresses impossibility.

The following example is a clause of a different type, for *indica* means, "set a price":

Plaut., Pers. 661: *Dor.* Tum tu pauca in verba confer: qui datur tanti indica.
Sag. Faciam ita ut te velle video, ut emas. Habe centum minis.
[*qui* Scioppius, edd., for *quid*.]

interrogative (*quis*) *quid*. For relative (*quis*) *quid* see Appendix III; especially, for the classification of the examples in this study, p. 200.

2. *Examples of Clauses More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Relative Clauses.*[28]

I. Ask

4 and 5. Quae & Qui, (Masculine Singular Substantive).[29]

Plaut. Pers. 636 and 638:

Do. Ubi tu nata es? . . . . .
. . . . . .
Do. At ego patriam te rogo quae sit tua.
Vi. Quae mihi sit nisi haec ubi nunc sum?
Do. At ego illam quaero *quae fuit.*[30]
Vi. Omne ego pro nilo esse duco quod fuit, quando fuit:
Tanquam hominem, quando animam ecflavit, quid eum quaeras *qui fuit?*

Quae fuit is most naturally understood, it seems to me, in the same way as *quae sit* in the preceding verse: namely, as an indirect question. In 638, the interpretation, "Why do you ask about him,—what sort of man he was?" is more natural than, "Why do you ask for him who is dead?"

13. Cur.

Cic. Att. XII 40, 3: Si quis requirit *cur* Romae non *sum*: quia discessus est; cur non sim in eis meis praediolis, quae sunt huius temporis: quia frequentiam illam non facile ferrem.[31]

[28] The examples in this section vary greatly in the degree in which the interpretation as indirect questions is the more natural one.

[29] For *qui* used like *quis*, cf. O. Seyffert, Review of Neue, "Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache," *B. P. W.*, XIII (1893), 277 ff.

[30] 636 *qui fuit* A (from vs. 638).

[31] *cur Romae non sim* edd. Baiter-Kayser n.: "*Romae non sum* M¹. *cur non sumus in eis* M¹: *cur non sim in his meis* M²."

Varro, Reliquorum de Grammatica Librorum Fragm., Goetz-Schoell, p. 230 (Keil I 439, 15): Nec ipsorum tamen, si interrogentur cur id secuti sunt, scientium.[32]

21. Unde.

Cic. Deorum Nat. II 6, 18: Quin et umorem et calorem, qui est fusus in corpore . . ., si quis quaerat *unde habemus*, apparet, quod aliud a terra sumpsimus, aliud ab umore.[33]

II. Inform

1. Quid.

Plaut. Cist. 57: Eloquere utrumque nobis,
Et quid tibist et quid velis nostram operam, ut nos sciamus.

It seems to me extremely improbable that this example or the ones with *quid* which follow are relative clauses. But see Appendix, p. 200.

Plaut Most. 572: *Da.* Quin tu istas mittas tricas? *Tr.* Quin quid vis, cedo.

The question intervenes between *cedo* and its modifier *quin*. Hence it is not a direct question.

Plaut. Pseud. 696a: Id tu modo me quid vis facere fac sciam.

Since the clause breaks into the main sentence, Becker's interpretation, p. 144, that it is a direct question is impossible.

Plaut. Pseud. 696c: Tu modo quid me facere vis fac ut sciam.[33a]

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Amph. 17: Nunc quoius iussu venio et quam ob rem venerim,
Dicam simulque ipse eloquar nomen meum.

Becker, p. 310, and Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.*, XXVIII, p. 51, interpret the clause as relative. This interpretation is the less

[32] *sunt* (or *essent*) codd.: *sunt* Keil: *sint* Putschius, Goetz-Schoell.

[33] *habemus* A B C P V O (according to Halm-Baiter): *habeamus* E, edd.

[33a] 696 b c om. A, Ritschl, Leo, Goetz-Schoell.

natural one, even apart from the parallel subjunctive clause. Cf. p. 52, criterion 1.

Plaut. Amph. 45: Nam quid ego memorem . . .
. . . quis benefactis meus pater,
Deorum regnator, architectus<t> omnibus?[34]

Most. 1040: Eadem opera haec tibi narravero,
Quis med exemplis hodie eludificatus est.

Becker, p. 245, is troubled by this example and remarks: "Certa medela nondum excogitata est." To interpret, "I will tell you these things, namely, the ways in which he made sport of me," would certainly be forced. As Becker himself says, *l.c.*, "de pronomine relativo vix ac ne vix quidem cogitari potest."

Plaut. Pseud. 21: *Ps.* Face me certum quid tibist: . . .
Cal. Cape has tabellas, tute hinc narrato tibi
Quae me miseria et cura contabefacit.

Rud. 1023: Quo argumento socius non sum et fur sum facdum ex te sciam.

Pomponius Bononiensis, Ribbeck II p. 251, 175: Sed qui utrosque error vos agitat, expedibo.

Ad Heren, III 7, 13: Divisione hac utemur: Exponemus quas res laudaturi sumus aut vituperaturi.[35]

Ad Heren II 31, 50: Misericordia commovebitur auditoribus, ... si ostendemus, in quibus commodis fuimus quibusque incommodis simus, comparatione.[36]

Varro L. L. VI 5, 39: Democritus, Epicurus, item alii qui infinita principia dixerunt, quae unde sint non dicunt, sed cuius modi sint, tamen faciunt magnum: *quae* ex [h]is *constant* in mundo, ostendunt.

Caesar B. G. I 20, 6: Dumnorigem ad se vocat, fratrem adhibet; quae in eo reprehendit ostendit, quae ipse intellegat, quae civitas queratur proponit.[37]

[34] *t* add. Pareus. Leo thinks a line is lost.

[35] Thus Marx: *simus*, Müller, with n.: "*sumus* H B b β, cf. Langen." Langen, *Philologus*, XXXVII, 406: "sane plurimi libri *sumus* habent, sed verum Parisinus."

[36] *in quibus commodis fuimus* b, l, d, C: om. H P Π B: *fuerimus* Ernest, Mue., Marx.

[37] *reprehendit* β (the class of codd. which is free from corrections of grammarians; cf. Kuebler, pp. VIII ff.), M: *reprehendat* other codd., edd.

Cic. Fam. VIII 1, 2: Si quid in re publica maius actum erit, quod isti operarii minus commode persequi possint, et quem ad modum actum sit et *quae* existimatio secuta *quaeque* de eo spes *est* diligenter tibi perscribemus.[38]

Leg. Agr. II 18, 49: Hic mihi parumper mentes vestras, Quirites, commovere videor, dum patefacio vobis *quas* isti penitus abstrusas insidias se posuisse *arbitrantur* contra Cn. Pompei dignitatem.[39]

This example is cited by Kroll, p. 6, as one in which indirect question and relative clause are indistinguishable. It seems to me most natural to interpret it as an indirect question. Lambinus and the editors who adopt his "emendation" clearly share this feeling.

Cic. C. M. 6, 18: At senatui quae sunt gerenda praescribo.[40]

Sall. Cat. 51, 4: Magna mihi copia est memorandi, patres conscripti, qui reges atque populi ira aut misericordia impulsi male consuluerunt.[41]

Virg. Georg. II 122: Quid tibi odorato referam sudantia ligno
Balsamaque et bacas semper frondentis acanthi?
Quid nemora Aethiopum molli canentia lana?
Velleraque ut foliis depectant tenuia Seres?
Aut *quos* Oceano propior *gerit* India lucos,
Extremi sinus orbis, ubi aëra vincere summum
Arboris haud ullae iactu potuere sagittae?

Georg. IV 150: Nunc age, naturas apibus *quas* Iuppiter ipse *Addidit*, expediam, pro qua mercede canoros Curetum sonitus crepitantiaque aera secutae Dictaeo caeli regem pavere sub antro.

In the last two passages, Jahn and other editors interpret the *quae*-clauses as relative. It seems to me more natural to regard them as indirect questions. Lucian Müller, on Horace Serm.

[38] *est* M H: *sit* edd.

[39] *arbitrentur* Lambinus, edd.

[40] *sunt* B S: *sint* other codd., edd.

[41] Codd. vary. See Dietsch *ad loc.*

II 4, 39 cites Georg. IV 150 as an instance of the indicative indirect question.

Virg. Aen. VI 615: Inclusi poenam expectant. Ne quaere doceri,
Quam poenam, aut quae forma viros fortunave mersit.

Gaffiot, *Rev. de Phil.*, XXVIII, p. 52, n. 2, interprets the dependent clause as relative. This interpretation seems to me very unnatural. Sidgwick, *ad loc*, remarks that "this interpretation would be so harsh as to be impossible." He adopts a change to *merset*, which, he says, is approved by Madvig.

Prop. II 34, 78: Tu canis Ascraei veteris praecepta poetae,
Quo seges in campo, quo viret uva iugo.

"You sing of the field in which . . . " (relative clause) is a less natural interpretation than "Your song tells in what field . . . " (indirect question).

Ovid Trist. IV, X 44: Saepe suas volucres legit mihi grandior aevo,
Quaeque nocet serpens, quae iuvat herba, Macer.[42]

Vitruv. II 1, 7: Igitur de his rebus quae sunt in aedificiis ad usum idoneae *quibusque sunt* qualitatibus et quas habeant virtutes, ut potero, dicam.

Vitruv. II 8, 16: Sed id genus quid ita a populo Romano in urbe fieri non oporteat, exponam, quaeque sunt eius rei causae et rationes non praetermittam.

Vitruv. IV Introduction, 2: Tertio autem [sc. disputavi] de aedium sacrarum dispositionibus et de earum generum varietate quasque et quot habeant species earumque *quae sunt* in singulis generibus distributiones.

Vitruv. IX 4, 6: *Quae sunt* ad dextram orientis inter zonam signorum et septentrionum sidera in caelo disposita, dixi [esse]; nunc explicabo *quae* ad sinistram orientis meridianisque partibus ab natura *sunt* distributa.

[42] *nocens* H P: *necet* A and other codd. *iuvet* A H and other codd.

5. Qui. (Masculine Singular Substantive; cf. p. 56, n. 29.)

Plaut. Pers. 646: Quis fuit? dic nomen. *Vi.* Quid illum miserum memorem qui fuit?
Nunc et illum Miserum et me Miseram aequomst nominarier.

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Plaut. Cist. 82: Hoc volo agatis: qua accersitae causa ad me estis, eloquar.

If Deecke, *De Usu Pronominis Relativi*, p. 54, is right, the fact that *qua* and *causa* are separated shows that the *qua causa* clause is not relative but interrogative. In that case, the clause is a practically certain instance of an indirect question; for to interpret it as a direct question would be so forced as to be practically impossible.

Cic. Leg. Agr. II 4, 15: Et quoniam, qua de causa et quorum causa ille hoc promulgavit, ostendi, doceat ipse nunc, ego quem possessorem defendam, cum agrariae legi resisto.[43]

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Plaut. Trin. 578: Sed, Stasime, abi huc ad meam sororem ad Calliclem:
Dic hoc negoti quo modo actumst. *St.* Ibitur.

If this clause is relative, the meaning is, "Dic hoc negoti eo modo quo actumst": "Tell her this business in the way in which it was done." Such an interpretation seems to me unnatural.

Cic. De Leg. I 9, 27: Nam et oculi nimis arguti, quem ad modum animo affecti sumus, loquuntur, et is qui appellatur vultus . . . indicat mores. . . .[44]

Ad Heren. IV 12, 17: Haec qua ratione vitare possumus, in arte grammatica dilucide dicemus.[45]

[43] Thus codd.: *promulgaverit* or *promulgarit* Mue. and other edd.

[44] *simus* H, Mue., other edd.: *sumus* AB (the best codd. according to Mue., p. xxxii), Halm-Baiter.

[45] *possumus* H P B, Marx: *possimus* Π C b l d, Mue.

Ad Heren. IV 56, 69: Demonstratum est enim, quomodo res in omnibus generibus causarum invenire oporteat; dictum est, *quo pacto* eas disponere *convenit*; traditum est, qua ratione esset pronuntiandum; praeceptum est, qua meminisse possemus; demonstratum est, quibus modis perfecta elocutio compararetur.[46]

10. Quantus, etc.

Cic. Tusc. V 41, 121: In quo quantum ceteris profuturi sumus non facile dixerim.[47]

It would be very forced to interpret the *quantum*-clause as relative. For the possibility that it is relative, cf. p. 55, n. 27.

11. Quot.

Ad Heren. I 10, 17: Enumeratione utemur, cum dicemus numero, *quot* de rebus *dicturi sumus*. . . . Expositio est, cum res, quibus de rebus dicturi sumus, exponimus breviter et absolute.[48]

Ovid Ibis 199: Nam neque *quot* flores Sicula *nascuntur* in Hybla
Quotve ferat dicam terra Cilissa crocos,
Nec, cum tristis hiemps aquilonis inhorruit alis,
Quam multa fiat grandine canus Athos.[49]

14. Qui (Adverb).

Plaut. Trin. 165: Quid tibi ego dicam, qui illius sapientiam
Et meam fidelitatem et celata omnia
Paene ille ignauos funditus pessum dedit?[50]

Lucr. V 274: Aëra nunc igitur dicam *qui* corpore toto
Innumerabiliter privas *mutatur* in horas.
Semper enim, quodcumque fluit de rebus, id omne
Aëris in magnum fertur mare.

[46] *convenit* H P B: *conveniat* E. The passage is bracketed by some edd., but not by Marx.

[47] *sumus* C: *simus* Beroald, edd.

[48] *sumus* codd. (except β), Marx: *simus* β, Müller, Langen in *Phil.*, XXXVII, 405.

[49] *Nascuntur* F G H M P T X Parm.: *pascuntur* Vat.: *nascantur* V edd. 202 fiet V.

[50] Becker, p. 245, suggests a change of *qui* to *quin*.

I agree with M. Patin and L. von Knebel in considering this clause an indirect question. Patin (Paris, 1876) translates: "Quant à l'air, il faut maintenant que je dise quels changements innombrables ont lieu"; von Knebel (Leipzig, 1831): "Nunmehr komm ich zur Luft, wie diese zu jeglicher Stunde, Fast unzaehlige Mal im ganzen Bestande sich aendert." H. A. J. Munro (ed. 4, Cambridge, 1886) and C. Bailey (Oxford, 1910) take *qui* as the relative, meaning "which."

19. Quam.

Plaut. Most. 459: Non potest
Dici quam indignum facinus fecisti et malum.

Ter. Hec. 91: Non dici potest
Quam cupida eram huc redeundi.

Hec. 646: Nosne hoc celatos tam diu! Nequeo satis
Quam hoc mihi videtur factum prave, proloqui.

For the possibility, the bare possibility, that these three *quam*-clauses are relative, see p. 55, n. 27. For Hec. 646 this interpretation is particularly difficult, since *satis* makes it the more unnatural to supply, in thought, a *tam* or *tantum*.

23. Ut.

The following clauses may conceivably be relative, as the *ut*-clause in Cic. Pro Milone 10, 29 almost certainly is: Dicam enim aperte, non derivandi criminis causa, sed ut factum est. However, it is more natural to interpret them as indirect questions.

Plaut. Amph. 460: Ibo ad portum atque haec uti sunt facta ero dicam meo.

Amph. 559: Tamen, quin loquar haec uti facta sunt hic,
Numquam ullo modo me potes deterrere.

Amph. 1042: Iam ad regem recta me ducam resque ut factast eloquar.

As. 367: Nunc tu abi ad forum ad erum et narra haec ut nos acturi sumus.

As. 376: *Le.* Pugno malam si tibi percussero,
Mox quom Sauream imitabor, caveto ne suscenseas.
Li. Hercle vero tu cavebis ne me attingas, si sapis,

Ne hodie malo cum auspicio nomen commutaveris.
Le. Quaeso, aequo animo patitor. *Li.* Patitor tu item quom ego te referiam.
Le. Dico *ut usust* fieri. *Li.* Dico hercle ego[51] quoque *ut* facturus *sum*.

Bacch. 1063: *Ch.* Non equidem capiam. *Ni.* At quaeso. *Ch.* Dico ut res se habet.
Ni. Morare. *Ch.* Nolo, inquam, aurum concredi mihi.

Merc. 351: Nunc si dico ut res est atque illam mihi me
Emisse indico, quem ad modum existumet me?

Rud. 1211: *Da.* Eloquere ut haec res optigit de filia;
Eum roga ut relinquat alias et huc veniat.

Trin. 712: Nil ego in occulto agere soleo: meus ut animust eloquar.
. . . . . si<c> sententiast.

Trin. 749: Ipsum † adeam Lesbonicum edoceam ut res se habet.[51a]

Ter. Adel. 513: Ego Micionem, si apud forumst,
Conveniam atque ut res gestast narrabo ordine.

Virg. Aen. VII 207: Atque equidem memini (fama est obscurior annis)
Auruncos ita ferre senes, his ortus ut agris
Dardanus Idaeas Phrygiae penetravit ad urbes.[52]

30. Various Connectives.

Sall. Cat. 23, 5: At Fulvia, insolentiae Curi caussa cognita, tale periculum rei publicae haut occultum habuit, set sublato auctore de Catilinae coniuratione, *quae quoque modo audierat*, compluribus narravit.[53]

IIB. Discuss

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Ter. Phorm. 798: Quid tu? Ecquid locutu's cum istac quam ob rem hanc ducimus?

[51] *usus* codd.: *usust* Lambinus, edd.
[51a] *habeat* C
[52] *penetravit* codd. except R; note in Ribbeck: "*penetrarit* R, Bentley, Hirtzel."
[53] See Dietsch *ad loc.*

IIC. Depict

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Ter. Eun. 585: Ibi inerat pictura haec, Iovem
Quo pacto Danaae misisse aiunt quondam in gremium imbrem aureum.

III. Find Out

4. Quae, etc.

Cic. Att. XIII 30, 3: Mi sicunde potes, erues qui decem legati Mummio fuerunt.[54]

Lentulus, in Cic. Fam. XII 15, 6: Si percurrero provinciam et cognovero *qui* nobis et rei p. fidem *praestiterunt* in conservanda pecunia a me deposita, *quique* scelere ultro deferentes pecuniam publicam hoc munere societatem facinorum cum Dolabella *inierunt* faciam vos certiores.[55]

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Cic. Verr. Act. II, II 53, 131: Iam vero censores quem ad modum isto praetore in Sicilia creati sunt, operae pretium est cognoscere.[56]

20. Ubi.

Plaut. Aul. 63: Nimisque ego hanc metuo male,
Ne mihi ex insidiis verba inprudenti duit
Neu persentiscat aurum ubist absconditum.

Becker's interpretation (p. 311) that the clause is relative, with *locum* understood, seems to me very forced.

23. Ut.

Plaut. Men. 808: *Ma.* Quin etiam nunc habet pallam, pater,
<Et> spinter, quod ad hanc detulerat, nunc, quia rescivi, refert.
Se. Iam ego ex hoc *ut factumst*, scibo.

Becker's interpretation (p. 307) that the clause is relative is, it seems to me, quite unnatural. Cf. p. 53, criterion 4.

[54] *fuerint* edd. Bai.-Kay. has n. cr.: "*fuerint* ed. Romana; *fuerunt* M."
[55] *praestiterint* . . . *inierint* Wesenb., Bai.
[56] *sunt* Lg. 29: *st'* Lg. 42: *sint* other codd., Lambinus, edd.

IIIB. Observe

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Capt. 384: Ergo animum aduortas uolo,
Quae nuntiare hinc te uolo in patriam ad patrem.

Most. 399: Animum aduorte nunciam tu, quae uolo accurarier.

IIID. Determine, Judge

4. Quae, etc.

Livy XLI 24, 4: Divinat etiam, quae futura fuerant si Philippus vixisset: quid ita Perseus regni haeres sit, quid parent Macedones, quid cogitent Romani.[57]

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Poen. 1185: *Ante.* Spero equidem. *Ade.* At pol ego, quom ingeniis quibu' sumus atque aliae gnosco.[58]

Ad Heren. II 20, 31: Quoniam igitur ostendimus perfectam et planam argumentationem ex quinque partibus constare, in una quaque parte argumentationis *quae* vitia vitanda *sunt* consideremus.[59]

Cic. Fin. IV 24, 67: Vestri autem progressionem ad virtutem fieri aiunt, levationem vitiorum fieri negant. At quo *utuntur* homines acuti argumento ad probandum, operae pretium est considerare.[60]

Ovid Met. XII 473: Et te, Caeni, feram? nam tu mihi femina semper,
Tu mihi Caenis eris, nec te natalis origo
Commonuit, mentemque subit, *quo* praemia facto
Quaque viri falsam speciem mercede *parasti?*[61]

[57] *fuerint* many edd.

[58] ig(no)s(co) A.

[59] *sint* Mue. with n. cr.: "*sunt* codices, *sint* editores." Langen, *Phil.*, XXXVII, 406: "*sunt* legitur in prima familia nonnullisque aliis." Langen would read *sint.* Marx reads *sunt.*

[60] *utantur* Lambinus, Mue., and other edd.

[61] *pararis* N.

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Plaut. Amph. 442: Certe edepol, quom illum contemplo et formam
cognosco meam,
Quem ad modum ego sum . . . nimi' similest
mei.

IV. Know

1. Quid.

Plaut. Truc. 786: Nec quid peccavi scio.[62]

It is very improbable that the *quid*-clause is relative. But see Appendix, p. 200.

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Capt. 206b: Quid a nobis metuit? Scimus nos
Nostrum officium quod est, si solutos sinat.

For this word-order in indirect questions cf. p. 49, n. 19. For the use of *quod* in place of *quid*, cf. M. G. 1344, Sed quid hoc? Quae res? Quod video? (*quod* cod., *quid* Ital., edd.); Poen. 547, Narravi uobis quod uostra opera mi opus siet (*quid* Ussing); Publ. Syr., Ribbeck II, p. 341, 375: Minus saepe pecces, si scias quod nescias (*quid* editors before Wöfflin); Cic. Fam. III II, 2: Quod enim?; Att. IV 7, 3: Quod superest?

Plaut. Capt. 207: At fugam fingitis: sentio quam rem agitis.

Pers. 109: Sed ecquid meministin here
Qua de re ego tecum mentionem feceram?
Sat. Memini: ut murena et conger ne cale-
fierent.

Pers. 515: Nescis quid te instet boni
Neque quam tibi Fortuna faculam lucriferam
adlucere uolt.

Gaffiot, *Rev. de Phil.*, XXVIII 51, interprets the clause as relative. This interpretation seems to me extremely forced. Becker, p. 220, would emend.

Plaut. Rud. 958: Furtum ego vidi qui faciebat;
Noram dominum, id cui fiebat.
Post ad furem egomet devenio

[62] *nec* or *net* codd. Becker (p. 262) suggests a change either of *quid* to *quod* or of *peccavi* to *peccarim*. Leo and Lindsay read *quod*. Goetz-Schoell reads *quid*, but suspects the passage.

Feroque ei condicionem hoc pacto:
'Ego istuc furtum scio *quoi factumst*:
Nunc mihi si vis dare dimidium,
Iudicium domino non faciam.'

Becker, p. 310, interprets this clause as relative. However, so far as I can find, *scire* has nowhere in early or classical Latin a personal object (unless there is prolepsis, as in Plaut. Men. 301, Neque te qui homo sis scio.).

Ter. Adel. 309: Non intellego
Satis quae loquitur. *Ca.* Propius obsecro accedamus, Sostrata.[63]

It would be unnatural to interpret: "I do not understand the things which he is saying." *Propius obsecro accedamus* shows that the defect is not one of imperfect comprehension, but of imperfect hearing. With this meaning of *intellego* the interrogative construction harmonizes better than the relative.

Cic. Att. IX 13, 3: Nec ego nunc, eum iuvare qua re possum, scio nec, si possem . . . adiuvandum putarem.[64]

Fam. II 9, 1: Itaque, cum primum audivi, ego ille ipse factus sum—scis quem dico—egique omnis illos adulescentes, quos ille actitat.[65]

Cf. the remark on Rud. 958, above.

Lael. 15, 55: Etenim cetera cum parant, cui parent nesciunt, nec cuius causa laborant . . . amicitiarum sua cuique permanet stabilis et certa possessio.[66]

Hor. Serm. II 4, 38: Nec satis est cara piscis averrere mensa
Ignarum quibus est ius aptius et quibus assis
Languidus in cubitum iam se conviva reponet.

For the possibility, the bare possibility, that this clause is relative, cf. p. 53, criterion 3. It seems to me almost certainly interrogative, and indeed the editors generally consider it an indirect question. Cf. the comments of Lucian Müller (1891),

[63] *satius quae loquitur* A: *satis quae loquatur* A^2 Σ.

[64] *possum* M: *possim* edd.

[65] *dicam* Mendelssohn, Bai.-Kay., Ernest, Tyrrell-Purser, without n. cr. Reisig-Schmalz, p. 494, says manuscript-reading is *dico*.

[66] *laborantur* P: *laborant* the other codd: *laborent* edd.

Palmer (1891), Lejay (1911). Heindorf alone (Breslau, 1815), so far as I know, suggests that the clause may be relative: "Ignarum, sc. eorum, quibus. Oder *est* und *reponet* stehen hier nach antiker und griech. Art für den Conjunktiv."

Manil. IV 211: Et licitum sciet et vetitum quae poena sequetur.[67]

5. Qui (Masculine Singular Substantive; cf. p. 56, n. 29).

Plaut. Rud. 965: *Tr.* Vidulum istum quoius est novi ego hominem iam pridem. *Gr.* Quid est?
Tr. Et quo pacto periit. *Gr.* At ego quo pacto inventumst scio:
Et qui invenit hominem novi, et dominus *qui* nunc *est* scio.
Nilo pol pluris tua hoc quam quanti illud refert mea.
Ego illum novi quoius nunc est: tu illum quoius antehac fuit.

Rud. 1297: Meum hercle illic homo vidulum scit qui habet, ut ego opinor.

For the last two examples, cf. Rud. 958, p. 67.

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Plaut. Men. 715: Non tu scis, mulier, Hecubam quapropter canem Graii esse praedicabant? *Ma.* Non equidem scio.

Cic. Fin. V 9, 24: Tum sensim incipit progredi seseque agnoscere et intellegere, quam ob causam habet eum, quem diximus, animi appetitum.[68]

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Plaut. Aul. 47: At scin quo modo tibi res se habet?

M. G. 257: Atque haec ei dice, monstra, praecipe,
Ut teneat consilia nostra, quem ad modum exorsi sumus,
De gemina sorore.

[67] *sequetur* M L^2 Van Wageningen: *sequentur* L^1: *sequatur* G.

[68] *habet* codd., Gaffiot, *Pour le Vrai Latin* 25: *habeat* Lambinus; edd. (note from Halm-Baiter): Mue. reads *habeat*, without note.

Ter. Adel. 636: Ego Aeschinem conveniam, ut quo modo acta haec sunt sciat.[69]

Plaut. Rud. 964: *Tr.* Vidulum istum quoius est novi ego hominem iam pridem. *Gr.* Quid est?
Tr. Et quo pacto periit. *Gr.* At ego quo pacto inventust scio.

Becker (p. 312) interprets these clauses as relative.

13. Cur.

Cic. Verr. Act II, III 26, 64: Iam omnes intelligunt cur universa provincia defensorem suae salutis eum quaesivit, cuius iste fidei, diligentiae, perseverantiae nulla ratione eripi possit.[70]

16. Qua.

Plaut. Most. 969: Scio qua me eire oportet et quo venerim novi locum.

Gaffiot, *Rev. de Phil.*, XXVIII, 54, interprets the *qua*-clause as relative.

21. Unde.

Ovid Her. XV 4: Ecquid ut aspecta est studiosae littera dextrae,
Protinus est oculis cognita nostra tuis?
An nisi legisses auctoris nomina Sapphus,
Hoc breve nescires *unde movetur* opus?[71]

Ovid Ex Ponto I 8, 25: Teque, quod et praesto est—quid enim tibi plenius optem?
Martia cum magno Caesare Roma probet.
Sed memor *unde abii*, queror, o iocunde sodalis,
Accedant nostris saeva quod arma malis.

For the possibility that the *unde*-clause is relative, cf. p. 52, criterion 2.

[69] *sunt* A, corr. A[1]; *sunt* B C D E F G P (critical note from Becker, p. 308): *sint* Umpfenbach, Tyrrell.

[70] Recent edd. read *quaesiverit*. Earlier edd. seem to have read *quaesivit*; see the quotation in Ramshorn, "Lateinische Grammatik" (Leipzig, 1830) II 712. Halm-Baiter has n. cr.: "*quaesiverit* Lg 42 H; *quaesierit* Lg 29 A B: *quaesivit* dtt."

[71] *movetur* codd. (except F and m) and most edd.: *veniret* F, Sarravianus, Palmer: *nominetur* (with gloss *veniret*)m according to De Vries (ed. Leyden, 1885).

V. Hear

4. Quae, etc.

Plaut. Pseud. 153: Huc adhibete auris quae ego loquor, plagigera genera hominum.[72]

Ter. H. T. 731: Mea Phrygia, audisti modo iste homo quam villam demonstravit Charini? *Ph.* Audivi. *Ba.* Proximam esse huic fundo ad dextram? *Ph.* Memini.

Becker, p. 285, suggests that the *quam*-clause may be relative, depending upon the following infinitive phrase, "villam Charini proximam esse huic fundo ad dextram." This does not seem to me to be the natural interpretation.

Lucr. I 269: Nequa forte tamen coeptes diffidere dictis, Quod nequeunt oculis rerum primordia cerni, Accipe praeterea *quae* corpora tute necess*est* Confiteare esse in rebus nec posse videri.

Prop. IV 8, 74: Atque ait "admissae si vis me ignoscere culpae Accipe quae nostrae formula legis erit. . . . ."

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Plaut. Rud. 356: Non audivisti, amabo, Quo pacto leno clanculum nos hinc auferre uoluit In Siciliam et quicquid domi fuit in navem inpos<i>vit?

Becker, p. 288, is troubled by this example: "Vix pro relativo habendum est."

VI. See

4. Quae, etc.

Cic. Fam. XIV 17: Nunc quae sunt negotia vides.[73]

Rosc. Am. 34, 95: Videamus nunc strictim, sicut cetera, quae post mortem Sex. Rosci abs te, T. Rosci, facta sunt.[74]

[72] *loquor* A, Leo, Lindsay: *loquar* P, Goetz-Schoell.

[73] Thus codd., Gaffiot, *Pour le vrai latin*, p. 25, Lambinus: *sint* edd.

[74] *sint* many edd.

Inv. II 12, 39: Videre igitur primum oportebit, quae sint continentia cum ipso negotio, hoc est, quae ab re separari non possunt.[75]

Virg. Aen. IX 269: Vidisti quo Turnus equo, quibus ibat in armis
Aureus; ipsum illum, clipeum cristasque rubentes
Excipiam sorti, iam nunc tua praemia, Nise.

Ovid Ars. Am. II 529: Dux bonus huic centum commisit vite regendos,
Huic equites, illi signa tuenda dedit:
Vos quoque, de nobis *quem* quisque *erit* aptus ad usum
Inspicite et certo ponite quemque loco.

Ars. Am. III 115: Simplicitas rudis ante fuit: Nunc aurea Roma est
Et domiti magnas possidet orbis opes.
Aspice *quae* nunc *sunt* capitolia, *quaeque fuerunt*:
Alterius dices illa fuisse Iovis.

In the last two examples an interpretation of the clauses under consideration as anything else than indirect questions would be very forced.

5. Qui (Masculine Singular Substantive; cf. p. 56, n. 29.).

Plaut. Men. 349: Videamus qui hinc egreditur.[76]

Rud. 956: Furtum ego vidi qui faciebat:
Noram dominum id cui fiebat.

The *cui*-clause is undoubtedly relative. The *qui*-clause, however, it seems to me, is more naturally interpreted as an indirect question.

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Varro, L. L. X 3, 58: Si multitudinis rectus casus forte figura corrupta erit, . . . prius id corrigemus quam inde ordiemur: ab obliquis adsumere oportet figuras eas quae non erunt ambiguae, sive singulares sive multitudinis, ex quibus id, *cuius modi debent* esse, perspici possi[n]t.[76a]

[75] *possunt* R, first hand of P, Ernest: *possint* A T, second hand of P, most edd.
[76] *hinc creditur* codd. (corr. B^2).
[76a] *debeant* changed by same hand to *debent*.

Because of the presence of *id*, it would be extremely harsh to regard the *cuius modi* clause as relative. Cf. p. 53, criterion 5.

23. Ut.

Ovid Trist. I IX 9: Aspicis, *ut* veniant ad candida tecta columbae,
Accipiat nullas sordida turris aves;
9 Horrea formicae *tendunt* ad inania numquam;
Nullus ad amissas *ibit* amicus opes;
11 *Ut*que comes radios per solis euntibus umbra *est*,
12 Cum latet hic pressus nubibus, illa *fugit?*
Mobile sic sequitur Fortunae lumina vulgus:
Quae simul inducta nocte teguntur, abit.

On the punctuation here adopted, *tendunt*, *ibit*, *est*, and *fugit* are instances of the indicative in indirect questions. Merkel and Owen punctuate so that they do not have any instances of the indicative indirect question.

30. Various Connectives.

Ov. Trist. I III 52: A quotiens aliquo dixi properante, "Quid urges?
Vel quo festinas ire, vel unde vide."[77]

VII. Concern

4. Quae, etc.

Lucr. II 814: Nec refert ea quae tangas quo forte colore
Praedita sunt.[78]

15. Quo.

Varro R. R. I 4, 4: Quod permagni interest, ubi sint positae villae, quantae sint, quo spectant porticibus, ostiis ac fenestris.[79]

21. Unde.

Manil. IV 117: Nec refert scelus unde cadit; scelus esse fatendum.[80]

[77] *festines* dett.

[78] *sint* Ald., Junt., other edd., for *sunt*. *Tangas* is in the subjunctive because it is an instance of the indefinite second person singular in a generalizing clause. Cf. Hale-Buck, §504, 2.

[79] *spectant* P A B: *spectent* v, edd.

[80] *cadat* g, many edd.; *cadit* the other codd., Van Wageningen.

VIII. Wonder

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Laberius, Ribbeck II, p. 282, 20:

Mirabar quo modo mammae mihi
Tam descendiderant.

X. No Verb Expressed

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Varro, L. L. VIII 1, 1:

Quom oratio natura tripertita esset . . ., cuius prima pars, quemadmodum vocabula rebus essent imposita, secunda, *quo pacto* de his declinata in discrimina *ierunt*, tertia, ut ea inter se ratione coniuncta sententiam efferant, prima parte exposita de secunda incipiam hinc.[81]

30. Various Connectives.

Varro, L. L. VIII 1, 2:

De huiusce multiplici natura discriminum orae sunt hae, cur et quo et quemadmodum in loquendo declinata sunt verba.[82]

[81] Goetz-Schoell reads *ierint*.

[82] *sunt* written s̃.

CHAPTER V

Indeterminate Examples: Indirect Questions or Conditions

I. Introductory: Review of Opinions concerning the Interrogative Use of *Si*

Opinions vary as to when the particle *si* came to be used to introduce indirect questions. Becker[1] expresses himself thus: "Denique moneo si particulam, ut videtur, apud Plautum et Terentium nondum integram interrogativae particulae vim nactam esse, sed particulae condicionalis naturam atque notionem ex parte retinuisse. In nonnullis enim exemplis indicativus occurrit, in quibus si poeta particula aliqua vere interrogativa usus esset, coniunctivus flagitaretur." Schmalz[2] thinks that perhaps the first occurrence of *si* in the sense of *num* is in Propertius. Gaffiot,[3] similarly, denies the interrogative use of *si* before Propertius and Livy. Lindskog[4] thinks that in Plautus *si* never introduces an indirect question, but that in Terence there are one or two passages "ubi suspicari liceat *si* particulam interrogativae vi praeditam esse." On the other hand, Riemann,[5] Marx,[6] and Bennett[7] hold that examples of this use occur in both Plautus and Terence.[8]

Why this difference of opinion? It seems to me that there are two main reasons for it. In the first place, some of the scholars

[1] *De Syntaxi Interrogationum Obliquarum* 195.

[2] *Lateinische Syntax* [4], 519.

[3] *Ecqui fuerit si particulae in interrogando latine usus* (Paris, 1904) 30 ff.; and "Le prétendu emploi de si interrogatif en latin," *Rev. de phil.*, XXXII (1908) 47 ff.

[4] *De Enuntiatis apud Plautum et Terentium Condicionalibus* (Lund, 1895) 79.

[5] *La langue et la grammaire de Tite Live* (Paris, 1885) 301; cf. also Riemann-Goelzer, *Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin* (Paris, 1897) 409.

[6] "Die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum,*" XXIII (1909), 445.

[7] *Syntax of Early Latin,* Vol. I, *The Verb* (Boston, 1910), 122.

[8] For the conclusions reached in the present study, cf. Appendix IV.

mentioned have preconceived ideas from which others are free. Becker's remark, cited above, "In nonnullis enim exemplis indicativus occurrit . . .," shows the ground of his opinion. Gaffiot, similarly, maintains the thesis that the indicative mood was not used in indirect questions until Augustan times.[9] In the second place, the terms "condition" and "indirect question" seem to be used in different ways. Thus Bennett, *l.c.*, applies the term "indirect question" to a type of examples which other scholars, while doubtless *understanding* them in the same way as Bennett understands them, might *classify* as loosely attached conditions. Examples are Plaut. Men. 1049, Nunc ibo intro ad hanc meretricem, quamquam suscenset mihi,/Si possum exorare ut pallam reddat; Cist. 652, Curc. 701, Poen. 1064, Trin. 921, Aul. 620.[10]

If there were generally accepted definitions of the terms "condition" and "indirect question," the second ground of difference would be removed. However, it would be extremely difficult, in the case of these constructions, to frame definitions which should be generally accepted, or indeed which should seem wholly satisfactory even to the person framing them.

II. Clauses whose Interpretation is Indifferent

1. *Introductory.* In the absence of a clear statement of the difference between the indirect question and the condition, we are groping in the dark when we try to distinguish particular *si*-clauses as instances of the one or of the other construction. It will be well, then, to be extremely cautious as we proceed.

It is particularly futile to attempt to label the *si*-clauses which are loosely attached. Cf. Cic. De Or. II 70, 283, Vide, Scaure, mortuus rapitur, si potes esse possessor; Virg. Aen. I 578, Equidem

[9] Cf. "(*Quis*) *quid relatif*," 59: "Dans Plaute, comme dans Ciceron, partout où la subordonnée est *incontestablement* une interrogative indirecte, elle est construite avec le subjonctif."

[10] Further, Bennett, *l.c.*, classes as indirect questions these two clauses which seem to me conditions: Amph. 773, Enim vero illud praeter alia mira miror maxime, Si haec habet pateram illam (I wonder at that more than at the other marvelous things, if she has that bowl; cf. Ter. Heaut. 525, Minimumque miror Clinia hanc si deperit), and Ter. Adel. 154, Nisi quidquid est, Volo scire atque hominem convenire, si apud forumst.

per litora certos Dimittam et Libyae lustrare extrema iubebo, Si quibus ciectus silvis aut urbibus errat; Plaut. Poen. 1064, Dic mihi, Ecquid meministi tuom parentum nomina, Patris atque matris? *Ag.* Memini. *Ha.* Memoradum mihi, si novi forte aut si sunt cognati mihi; Trin. 959, Enim vero ego nunc sycophantae huic sycophantari uolo, Si hunc possum illo mille nummum Philippum circumducere; Men. 1049, Nunc ibo intro ad hanc meretricem, quamquam suscenset mihi, Si possum exorare ut pallam reddat quam referam domum. These passages are cited by Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.*, XXXII, pp. 33 ff. In all of them *si* may be rendered "in case," "on the chance that."

Sometimes, as, for instance, in the last example, such a loosely attached *si*-clause follows a verb which does not ordinarily introduce an indirect question. I should not class such an example as an indirect question, though I should not deny that it *may* be one. Neither should I class the *si*-clauses in the other passages just cited, as indirect questions. I should rather consider that whenever a *si*-clause which occurs after a verb that may introduce an indirect question, can be paralleled by a *si*-clause which occurs after a verb that may *not* introduce an indirect question, the former *si*-clause may conceivably be something else than an indirect question.

The examples just cited, however they may be labeled, are in any case loosely attached clauses. If they are indirect questions, they are not indirect questions of the usual sort. No examples of this kind are included in the list that is given below.

There are other examples which may be regarded either as loosely attached clauses, or as indirect questions which are *closely* attached to the introductory verb (i.e., indirect questions of the usual kind). An instance is Cic. Att. IX 7C1, cited p. 78. *Temptemus . . . si possumus* may mean either, "Let us make an attempt in case we can"—the *si*-clause being loosely attached to the main verb, alike whether it is labeled as a condition or as an indirect question—or, "Let us try whether we can"—the *si*-clause being an indirect question closely attached to the main verb. There are still other examples which may be either closely attached indirect questions or closely attached conditions. Cf. Virg. Aen. I 322, cited below. Instances of both these kinds are included in the following list and are cited indiscriminately.

2. *Examples of Clauses whose Interpretation is Indifferent.*

II. Inform

Ter, Phorm. 675: 'Quantum potest me certiorem' inquit 'face,
Si illam dant, hanc ut mittam, ne incertus siem,
Nam illi mihi dotem iam constituerunt dare.'

This may mean either, "Let me know whether . . .," or "Let me know it if . . ."

For the following example there are similar alternatives.

Virg. Aen. I 322: Monstrate mearum
Vidistis si quam hic errantem forte sororum.

III. Find Out

Caesar in Cic., Att. IX 7 C, 1: Temptemus hoc modo si possumus omnium voluntates recuperare et diuturna victoria uti.[11]

This passage may mean either, "Let us try whether . . .," or, "Let us make an attempt, in case. . . ." Cf. p. 77.

IV. Know

Plaut. Men. 142: Iam sciam si quid titubatumst, ubi reliquias videro.

This passage may mean either, "I shall know it, if there's been a mis-step . . .", or "I shall know whether there's been a mis-step. . . ." The following example is similar.

Plaut Merc. 156: Quin iam prius quam sum elocutus, scis si mentiri uolo.[12]

Virg. Aen. II 739: Namque avia cursu
Dum sequor, et nota excedo regione viarum,
Heu! misero coniunx fatone erepta Creusa
Substitit, erravitne via, *seu* lassa *resedit*
Incertum, nec post oculis est reddita nostris.[12a]

[11] *possimus* Mue. and other edd.: *possumus* codd., Wesenb., Boot, Tyrrell.

[12] *scis si* Camerarius: *scisset* (*scisse* P^{CD}) codd.

[12a] Strictly, the alternative interpretations of the *seu*-clause are not indirect question and condition, but indirect question and direct question. Cf. pp. 8 ff. The example is given here with the *si*-clauses, because of the relationship between *seu* and *si*.

VI. See

Plaut. Cas. 591: Viso huc, amator si a foro rediit domum.

For *visere* used absolutely, cf. Most. 793, Vise, specta tuo usque arbitratu. For its use with an indirect question, cf. Stich. 328, Ego quid me velles visebam; M.G. 708.

Cic. Verr. Act. II, III 77, 180: Vide, quaere, circumspice, si quis est forte ex ea provincia . . . qui te nolit periisse.

III. Clauses Which, if an Indicative Indirect Question Exists, are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Conditions[13]

1. *Indications that Clauses are Indirect Questions rather than Conditions.* There are a number of *si*-clauses which might be interpreted as conditions but are more naturally understood as indirect questions. No more definite reason can generally be given for the preference of the latter interpretation than that this interpretation harmonizes better with the context.

In one or two instances in later Latin (cited in Part II) the interpretation of the *si*-clause as an indirect question is favored by the occurrence, near to it, and in a corresponding use, of an indirect question or equivalent construction. Cf. Aug. Civ. Dei XVII, 20, Videamus ergo si sermones illius veri sunt et temptemus quae eventura sunt illi et sciemus quae erunt novissima illius. Again, the verb may seem to demand an object, and the *si*-clause may be the most available object. Cf. Sen. Oed. 211, Germane nostrae coniugis, fessis opem Si quam reportas, voce properata edoce.

In this, as in the preceding chapter, the *si*-clauses are, generally speaking, of two kinds. If they are not interpreted as indirect questions, some must be regarded as closely attached conditions and others as clauses that are loosely attached. An example of the former kind is Plaut. Rud. 323 (see below); one of the latter kind is Hor. Ep. I 7, 39 (p. 84).

Many of the examples cited below are practically certain examples of indirect questions. Perhaps they should have been cited in

[13] The term condition is loosely used in this chapter to designate all *si*-clauses that are not indirect questions.

Chapter VIII. Riemann-Goelzer classes most of our examples with the verb "see" as instances of interrogative *si*. Cf. Riemann-Goelzer, p. 409, esp. n. 5: "Ce qui prouve qu'après *videre* et *visere*, *si* a bien la valeur d'une particule interrogative et n'est pas une particule conditionnelle, c'est que dans la langue correcte on trouve *-ne* ou *num* en pareil cas." However, bearing in mind the existence of loosely attached *si*-clauses like the one in Cic. De Or. II 70, 283 (cited p. 76), I have taken pains to include in Chapter VIII only the absolutely certain instances of interrogative *si*.

2. *Examples of Clauses More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Conditions.*

I. Ask

Plaut. Rud. 329: Eadem, sacerdos Veneria haec si quid amplius scit,
Si videro exquisivero; faciet me certiorem.

The most natural interpretation is that *sacerdos . . . si . . . scit* is an indirect question depending upon *exquisivero*. It is less natural to regard this clause as a condition, with *faciet* as its conclusion, and to consider *si videro exquisivero* a parenthesis.

II. Inform

Plaut. Rud. 323: *Tr.* Ecquem adulescentem huc, dum hic astatis, expedite,
Vidistis ire strenua facie, rubicundum, fortem . . .
Pi. Nullum istac facie ut praedicas venisse huc scimus. *Tr.* Ecquem
Recaluom ad Silanum senem . . . ?
Pi. Cum istiusmodi virtutibus operisque, natus qui sit,
Eum quidem ad carnuficem est aequius quam ad Venerem commeare.
Tr. At *si vidistis* dicite. *Pi.* Huc profecto nullus venit.

"At si vidistis dicite" is apparently a repetition in indirect form of the question, "Ecquem . . . recaluom. . . ." To

explain *si* in this passage as a conditional particle and to interpret, "But if you saw him, tell me so," seems to me, as to Marx (p. 445), "eine Künstelei." This example is not mentioned by Gaffiot.

IIID. Determine, Judge

Plaut. As. 399: *Li.* Nihilo mage intus est. . . .
Me. Argenti viginti minas, si adesset, accepisset.
Li. Qui pro istuc? *Me.* Asinos vendidit Pellae mercatori
Mercatu. *Li.* Scio. Tu id nunc refers? Iam hic credo eum adfuturum.
Me. Qua facie vester Saurea est? *Si* is *est*, iam scire potero.

The natural meaning is, "I shall be able to determine whether he is the man"; not as Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 17, apparently interprets, "If he is the man, I shall be able to determine that fact."

Vitruv. II 8, 19: Tunc si est firma probatur.

Vitruv. VII 14, 3: De aqua . . . et qua ratione ducatur quibusque rebus si erit salubris et idonea probetur explicabo.

Morgan, *On the Language of Vitruvius*, p. 488, considers these two examples "conditional protases used instead of indirect questions." It seems to me necessary to regard them as indirect questions.

IV. Know

Plaut. Epid. 550: Novin ego te? *Ph.* Si ego te novi animum inducam ut tu noveris.

The meaning may be either, "Do I know you? *Ph.* I shall give you reason to know whether I know you"; or, "Do I know you? *Ph.* If I know you, I shall give you reason to know (whether you know me)." The former interpretation seems to me the more natural one.

VI. See

Plaut. Pers. 825: Nequeo, leno, quin tibi saltem staticulum olim quem Hegea
Faciebat. Vide vero, si tibi satis placet.

Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 14, *Rev. de phil.*, p. 51, considers the *si*-clause the equivalent of "si quidem, si certe satis placet." This is possible; but it seems to me far more natural to interpret, "Just see whether it pleases you."

Plaut. Trin. 748: Vide si hoc utibile magis atque in rem deputas:
Ipsum adeam Lesbonicum, edoceam ut res se habet.[14]

On the reading of A, Gaffiot's interpretation—*Ecqui fuerit*, p. 13—of the *si*-clause as a condition, with its conclusion in "ipsum adeam . . .," may be possible, though there is no parallel, so far as I know, for such a use of the volitive subjunctive in the conclusion of a condition.[15] On the reading of P, Gaffiot's interpretation is still more forced: "If you think this advisable, that I go to Lesbonicus, I will inform him of the facts." From the punctuations of Goetz-Schoell, Leo, and Lindsay, it seems that these scholars feel the clause to be an indirect question.

Plaut. Trin. 763: Sed vide consilium si placet.

Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 14, *Rev. de phil.*, XXXII, p. 52, would take the *si*-clause as conditional, and equivalent to *s'il te plaît*: "Margaronides interrompt les réflexions de Callicles, qui, un premier projet rejeté, est là pensif, sans entrevoir d'issue à la situation. Aussi emploie-t-il la petite précaution polie *si placet*: c'est moins sec; cela donne du liant à la conversation." To my mind, the use of "s'il te plaît" would be over-polite and not natural in this situation. I should interpret: "But look at my plan, whether it pleases you." It is possible, however, in this example, to resort to the interpretation, "pour le cas où" (cf. Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.*, XXXII, pp. 53 ff.).

Ter. Adel. 239: Unum hoc habeo: vide si satis placet.

Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 19, wrests the following meaning out of the passage: "Unum hoc habeo, quod tibi proponam; si satis placet, vide quid eo facere velis (arrange-toi, fais-en ton

[14] *ipsum* A: *ut* P.

[15] For the use of the volitive subjunctive in the first person singular, cf. Hale-Buck, *Latin Grammar*, §501, 2. Gaffiot calls the subjunctive potential, but, since he paraphrases with *adibo* and *edocebo*, he uses the word loosely.

profit)." Cf. also *Rev. de phil.*, XXXII, p. 51. Tyrrell, whose punctuation I follow, and Bennett, p. 122, give the *si*-clause its natural interpretation, as an indirect question.

Ter. Eun. 545: Homo ipse nusquamst neque scio quid dicam
aut quid coniectem.
Nunc mi hoc negoti ceteri dedere ut illum
quaeram.
Idque adeo visam si domist.

In view of the context—the speaker is looking for a man who is nowhere to be found—, it is far more natural to interpret, "And so I shall see whether he is at home," than, with Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 21, "And so I shall see him, if he is at home."

Ter. Eun. 838: *Py.* . . . Vide amabo, si non, quom aspicias,
os impudens
Videtur! *Th.* Non est? *Py.* Tum quae eius
confidentiast!

Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 20, would consider the *si*-clause a true condition, with its conclusion in *tum quae eius confidentiast.* The examples which he cites of the use of *tum* in conclusions—Plaut. M. G. 1365, Si id facies tum demum scibis, and others—are not parallel; for in them the conclusion follows as a result of the condition, while here the condition would be adversative. Even apart from the *tum*, the meaning which Gaffiot extracts from the passage is strained.

Ter. H. T. 170: Tempust monere me hunc vicinum Phaniam
Ad cenam ut veniat: ibo visam si domist.

In this context the interpretation of Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 20, "Visam eum, saltem si domist," is less unnatural than in the preceding example. Here also, however, to me as to Tyrrell—whose punctuation I adopt—the natural interpretation seems to be: "I shall see whether he is at home."

Ter. Phorm. 553: Vide si quid opis potes adferre huic.

Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 19, *Rev. de phil.*, XXXII, p. 54, places a comma before *si* and interprets: "Consider, in case. . . ." The natural meaning of the passage, it seems to me, is that which it has on Tyrrell's punctuation: "See whether. . . ."

Hor. Ep. I 7, 39: Inspice si possum donata reponere laetus.

Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 27, *Rev. de phil.*, XXXII, p. 54, considers the *si* equivalent to *si quidem*: " 'Fais attention à tout cela, dans l'hypothèse que je suis capable de rendre d'un coeur allègre les présents reçus; c'est-à-dire, 'fais attention, car. . . .' " Gaffiot's interpretation, while it cannot be *proved* wrong, seems to me absurd. The natural understanding of the passage is that "inspice si" means "look whether," and that "si possum . . ." is—as Plessis, *ad loc.* regards it—an indirect question.

CHAPTER VI

Indeterminate Examples: Miscellaneous

There are a few possible instances of the indicative indirect question which do not fall into any of the preceding parts of this study. They are cited here.

III. Find Out

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Cic Att. III 23, 4: Ut Ninnium aut ceteros fugerit investiges velim et quis attulerit, et *quare* octo tribuni pl. ad senatum de me referre non dubitarint . . . eidem in abrogando tam cauti *fuerunt*, ut id metuerent, soluti cum essent, quod ne iis quidem, qui lege tenentur, est curandum.[1]

It may be that, when Cicero wrote *fuerunt*, the clause in which it occurs no longer felt to him like an indirect question.

IV. Know

19. Quam.

Plaut. Poen. 441: Scin quam videtur? Credin quod ego fabuler?

Thus Leo and Lindsay. Lindsay n. cr.: "Vel sic distingue: *scin quam? videtur*—." Goetz-Schoell has the latter punctuation.

21. Unde.

Plaut. Amph. 424:

So. Signi dic quid est.
Me. Cum quadrigis Sol exoriens. Quid me captas, carnufex?
So. Argumentis vicit, aliud nomen quaerundum est mihi.
Nescio unde haec hic spectavit.

The meaning may be either, "I do not know from what place he saw these things"—indirect question—, or "From some place or other he saw these things."

[1] *fuerunt* or *fuerant* codd.: *fuerint* Bosius, edd.

VI. See

23. Ut.

Plaut. As. 149: At scelesta viden ut ne id quidem me dignum esse existumat
Quem adeat, quem conloquatur quoique irato supplicet?

It is conceivable that *viden ut* is parenthetical, and that the sentence is declarative, not interrogative. However, this is not the natural interpretation.

Plaut. Truc. 463: Vosmet iam videtis ut ornata incedo:
Puerperio ego nunc med esse aegram adsimulo.

Becker, p. 246, would place, with Studemund, a colon after *videtis* and a comma after *incedo*. Becker compares Pseud. 979.

CHAPTER VII

The Proofs that Clauses are Indirect Questions

I. The Discrimination of the Indirect Question from All Other Kinds of Clauses

There are a number of indicative clauses which cannot possibly be interpreted as anything else than indirect questions. Any other interpretation of these clauses would yield no sense, or would yield a sense which would be impossible in the given context, or would involve the violation of some rule of grammar. The specific criteria which have been found to be of assistance in distinguishing indirect questions from other constructions are enumerated below.

There is one phenomenon which distinguishes an indirect question from all other kinds of clauses, the phenomenon of illogical prolepsis.[1] By illogical prolepsis is meant the use of the logical subject of a question as the grammatical, but illogical, object[2] of the introductory verb. Cf. Plaut. Pseud. 1184 *Chlamydem* hanc commemora quanti conductast. In this sentence the clause introduced by *quanti* must be an indirect question, for only if this clause is so interpreted will the introductory clause yield sense. By itself, "Chlamydem hanc commemora" does not mean anything.

II. The Discrimination of the Indirect from the Direct Question

(1) The meaning of the interrogative clause itself may preclude the possibility that it is a direct question. Cf. Cic. Att. VII 26, 3, Quid

[1] Becker, *op. cit.*, 165 ff., has observed that this kind of prolepsis is a criterion for distinguishing indirect from direct questions.

Becker designates this kind of prolepsis by the term "artificial" ("*artificiosa*"). This term is objected to by Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, p. 75, on the ground that the phenomenon must have originated quite naturally. Lindskog considers the examples of illogical prolepsis survivals from a time when the accusative case was used more freely than in the Latin which has come down to us. Cf. his "Zur Erklärung der Accusativ mit Infinitiv Construction im Latein," *Eranos* I (1896) 132. In any case, whether these examples are survivals or products of analogy, the term "artificial" is misleading. I have, accordingly, used the word "illogical" instead.

[2] Or, occasionally, subject. Cf. Paulus Ed. 23, 2, 10, Si fuerit ignotus ubi degit.

habebo certi faciam ut scias. It would be impossible to interpret: "Of what shall I be certain? I shall inform you of it."

(2) The meaning of the accompanying verb or clause may show that a following question is indirect. Thus in Plaut., M. G. 36, Scio iam quid vis dicere, it is impossible for the speaker, after he has said that he knows, to proceed to a direct question, which would be reasonable only if he did *not* know. For an example with a different verb, cf. Merc. 783, Dicam id quid est. *Dicam* cannot introduce a direct question (unless it be a *directly quoted* one).[3]

Sometimes, while the introductory verb in itself is compatible with a direct question, its modifiers necessitate the interpretation of the question as indirect. Cf. Cic., Att. VII 12, 1, Sed quaeso ut scribas quam saepissime, non modo si quid scies aut audieris, sed etiam si quid suspicabere, maximeque quid nobis faciendum putas. *Quaeso ut scribas* might be followed by a direct question, but not *quaeso ut scribas quam saepissime, . . . maximeque.*

(3) The logic of the larger passage of which the clause under discussion is a part, may make it impossible to interpret the clause under consideration as a direct question. Cf. Sen., Nat. Quaest. III 20, 2: Hae causae saporem dant aquis varium . . . Interest, utrum loca sulphure an nitro an bitumine plena transierunt; hac ratione corruptae cum vitae periculo bibuntur.[4] If it were not for the logic of the larger passage to which the *utrum . . . an* clause belongs, it would be possible (though still not natural) to interpret: "It makes a difference. Have the waters passed through regions rich in sulphur or in natron or in bitumen?"

It must be borne in mind, as we proceed, that indirect questions are to be discriminated not only from direct, unquoted questions, but also from directly quoted questions. Directly quoted questions occur with verbs which express or imply an idea of saying or of asking. Cf. " 'What are you doing?' he says"; " 'What are you doing?' he asks." Cf. Plaut. Amph. 912: 'Cur dixisti?' inquies. Now, there is no possibility of confusion between the directly quoted question in " 'Quid facis?' dicit," and the indirect question in "Quid facis dicit"; for a verb of saying with an indirect question yields a totally

[3] See the third paragraph below.

[4] This example, from Part II, is cited here because there is no example in Part I to which the principle so well applies.

different meaning from a verb of saying with a directly quoted question. The context enables one to discriminate with certainty between the two expressions. After verbs of asking the case is different. " 'Quid facis?' rogat," and "Quid facis rogat" have the same general meaning. Wherever an indirect question is used with a verb of asking,[5] it is conceivable that a directly quoted question should have been used instead. In the case of an indicative question which is used with a verb that expresses or implies an idea of asking, it is, accordingly, impossible to determine with absolute certainty whether the question is indirect or is directly quoted.[6]

There is an exception to this statement, and that is in the case of *double* questions: (4) If, in a double question of fact, the indicative occurs in one half and the subjunctive in the other, the indicative verb must, like the subjunctive verb, be in an indirect question. Cf. Asconius in Cornelianam 54 (cited p. 144). It would be impossible to regard one half of the question as indirectly quoted and the other half as directly quoted. The subjunctive shows that the one half is indirectly quoted. Therefore, the other half must be indirectly quoted also.

After verbs other than those which express or imply inquiry, if we know that a question is dependent, we know also that it is indirect.[7] Except after a verb of inquiry, a proof that a question is dependent is a proof that it is indirect. The following circumstances, then, which show that questions are dependent, show also (with the reservation mentioned) that they are indirect.

[5] In such a case, an indirect question is an indirect quotation (cf. p. 4, n. 4). For the difference between direct and indirect quotation, cf. J. J. Schlicher, "The Moods of Indirect Quotation," *A J P* XXVI (1905), 69: "Direct quotation is the repetition of the *form* in which the original speaker expressed certain ideas, while indirect quotation is the expression by the hearer of these *ideas* as they lie in his own mind."

[6] For the distinguishing of indirect questions by a shift of tense or person, see p. 91.

[7] After a verb of saying, to be sure, a dependent, directly quoted question may occur; but, as was explained above, such a question would have a totally different meaning from an indirect question, and—unless it were apart from its context—could not be confused with one. It may, accordingly, be left out of account in this discussion.

(5) A question is dependent if it breaks into the midst of the sentence that introduces it.[8] Cf. Plaut. Pseud. 696a: Id tu modo me quid vis facere, fac sciam, where the question *Me quid vis facere* breaks into the introductory clause, *Id tu modo fac sciam*.[9] It is not, however, always possible to determine whether a question does break into the introductory sentence. In Pers. 640, Sed tamen, virgo, quae patriast tua age mihi actutum expedi, *sed tamen* may conceivably be felt with the question, and not with *expedi*. And in a sentence like Capt. 964, Tandem istaec aufer, dic quid fers, ut feras hinc quod petis, or Men. 779, Loquere uter meruistis culpam, paucis, non longos logos, the part that follows the question may be an afterthought.

In one instance the sentence that is interrupted by the clause under consideration consists of an introductory verb and a subjunctive indirect question. This instance is Ad Heren. I 6, 10, Quid alii soleant, quid nos facturi sumus, breviter exponemus. In such an example, it is not the parallel use of a subjunctive indirect question that proves the indicative question to be dependent, but rather the fact that the indicative question interrupts the sentence.[10]

(6) If two or more questions of detail[11] are connected by correlative conjunctions—*et . . . et*, *aut . . . aut*, *neque . . . neque*—they must be dependent. Cf. Plaut., Cist. 57, Eloquere utrumque nobis, Et quid tibist et quid velis nostram operam, ut nos sciamus.

(7) A clause is dependent if it is connected, by a conjunction, to a noun which is in a grammatical relation with some verb. Cf. Tibull. II 4, 18, Nec refero solisque vias et qualis, ubi orbem Complevit, versis Luna recurrit equis.

[8] It is, to be sure, conceivable that a sentence should be broken into by a parenthetical, independent question. However, in none of the examples to which criterion 5 applies, would it be possible to interpret the question under consideration as parenthetical.

[9] Lindskog, *Quaestiones*, 95, has observed a connection between the position of clauses and their dependence or independence: "Id solum hic velim dicere, quo magis ita excoleretur lingua latina, ut hypotactica structura pro paratactica uteretur, eo magis eam collocationem, qua insereretur secundaria in primariam, amatam esse."

[10] If the order of the clauses were different, and the conjunction *et* were used, it might be possible—though it would not be natural—to interpret: Quid nos facturi sumus? Breviter exponemus, et (sc. exponemus) quid alii soleant.

[11] It is conceivable that the connectives mentioned should join "yes and no questions." A combination like *Et tu ad eum isti et is ad te venit?* is possible.

It may be thought that for questions introduced by *num*, there is still another criterion. When it introduces a direct question, *num* suggests a negative answer, but when it introduces an indirect question, it is non-committal.[12] Any indicative *num*-questions for which a negative answer is clearly not suggested, would, accordingly, necessarily be indirect. However, I know of only one *num*-question in which a negative implication seems impossible: Prop. III 5, 43 (cited pp. 17 ff.); and even apart from this circumstance, the question can hardly be direct.

In some languages, as English, German, and French, the position of the verb in the question may indicate whether the question is direct or indirect. In Latin, however, this seems not to be the case.[13]

It is sometimes said that a shift in person or tense may show that a clause is dependent. Eduard Hermann, in "Gab es im Indogermanischen Nebensätze," *K. Z. Z.*, XXXIII (1895), p. 486, opposes this view. In "A laesst dir (C) sagen, du (C) sollst zu ihm kommen," the second clause may be independent. If it is dependent, we feel it to be so not because of a shift in person, but "wegen der kurzen Pause zwischen beiden Sätzen, und wegen der monotonen Aussprache des zweiten." For the use that has been made in this study, of shifts in tense or person, see p. 25, criterion 4.

Frank, *Attraction of Mood in Early Latin*, p. 28, remarks that in the direct question in Plautus, the feminine substantive form of the interrogative pronoun is *quis*, while in the indirect question it is *quae*. This observation gives no help in distinguishing indirect from direct indicative questions; for none of our apparent instances of the indicative indirect question from Plautus contains a feminine substantive interrogative pronoun.[14]

III. The Discrimination of the Indirect Question from the Exclamation

The proofs that clauses are not exclamations are practically the same as the proofs that clauses are not direct questions. Cf. pp. 87 ff.

[12] Cf. Hale-Buck §§231, I d and 537 d 2.

[13] My observations confirm the conclusion of Morris, *Principles and Methods in Latin Syntax* (New York, 1901) 125, that in Latin "there appears to be no tendency to indicate subordination by the position of the verb."

[14] The only instance that I have noted of an indicative indirect question introduced by a feminine substantive pronoun is Buecheler 73, 1 (cited p. 99). Here the form of the pronoun is *quae*.

(1) The content of the clause under debate may preclude exclamatory feeling. So in Varro, R. R. II 5, 9 (cited p. 104) the meaning of the *quibus*-clause in its context is such that the clause would not be uttered in an exclamatory tone. It would be impossible to punctuate: Et praeterea quibus regionibus nati sunt! Refert.

(2) The meaning of the accompanying word or clause may demand that the clause under consideration be regarded as an indirect question. Cf. Publilius Syrus, Ribbeck II, p. 339, 348, Magis valet qui nescit quid valet calamitas.

(3) The logic of the larger passage which contains the clause may demand that the clause be understood as an indirect question. Cf. Plaut Pseud. 263a, Nosce saltem hunc quis est. *Ba.* Iam diu scio *Qui fuit*: nunc qui is est ipsus sciat. In this example, if the sentence, "Iam diu scio Qui fuit" were considered by itself, it might be possible—though it would not be natural—to regard the *qui*-clause as an exclamation: "I have long known it—what kind of man he has been! The larger context, however, makes it necessary to regard the clause as an indirect question.

(4) To prove that a clause is not an exclamation, it is sufficient to show that it is dependent[15] and is not a quotation. For proofs that clauses are dependent, cf. pp. 89 ff., criteria 4-6. A quoted exclamation may occur only after a verb that expresses or implies an idea of saying. A possible—but not probable—instance of a directly quoted exclamation is Ter., Hec. 472, cited p. 33.

IV. The Discrimination of the Indirect Question from the Relative Clause

A dependent indicative clause that is introduced by an indeterminate form of the relative-interrogative pronoun,[16] or by any relative-interrogative connective, can be certainly recognized as an indirect question, by the following circumstances.

(1) Disagreement in number or gender between the introductory word of the dependent clause and the word in the main clause—

[15] Outside of quotation, there is no such thing as a dependent exclamation that is distinct from a dependent question. Cf. p. 29, n. 1.

[16] All forms are indeterminate except *quis* and *quid;* and sometimes these are indeterminate. Cf. Appendix III.

expressed or understood—with which the introductory word, if it were relative, would agree. Cf. Cic., Har. Resp. 17, 37, Obscure dicitur, quae sacra polluta sunt (*sint* some codd., cf. p. 97).[17]

(2) The presence in the main clause of a word with which the dependent clause as a whole must be in apposition. Cf. Plaut., Bacch. 720, *Ch.* Quid tu loquere? *Mn.* Hoc, ut futuri sumus. If the dependent clause were relative, the passage would mean, "(Loquor) ita ut facturi sumus" (cf. n. 18, below). In that case *hoc* could not be used.

(3) The circumstance that the dependent clause, if interpreted as relative, would yield either no sense or a different sense from that demanded by the context. Cf. Cato, Agr. Cult. VI 4, Vineam quo in agro conseri oportet, sic observato (The meaning is certainly not: "Observe the field in which."); Ad Heren. IV 9, 13, Quibuscum bellum gerimus, iudices, videtis: cum sociis, qui pro vobis pugnare . . . soliti sunt; Prop. II 30, 29, Illic aspicies scopulis haerere Sorores Et canere antiqui dulcia furta Iovis, Ut Semela est combustus, ut est deperditus Io, Denique ut ad Troiae tecta volarit avis. *Ut* cannot be relative, for the meaning "in such a way as" would not be possible.[18]

[17] The objection may be raised, that if "Nota enim mihi sunt, quae in me post Caesaris mortem contulerint," is a contamination of "Notum est, quae contulerint" and "Nota sunt, quae contulerunt" (cf. my "The Confusion of the Indirect Question and the Relative Clause in Latin," *Classical Philology XIII* [1918] 66), "Obscure dicitur, quae sacra polluta sunt" may be a contamination of "Obscure dicitur quae sacra polluta sint," and "Obscure dicuntur quae sacra polluta sunt." However, it would, as it seems to me, be unjustifiable to resort to this complicated interpretation when a simple one is available.

It would seem unjustifiable, too, to interpret the passage under discussion in the light of the rare, and somewhat irregular, used of the relative clause found in Trin. 1123, Nunc is propere conveniendust ut quae cum eius filio Egi ei rei fundus pater sit potior. (That the matters which I have transacted with his son, that this arrangement may be officially confirmed by the father.) To interpret "Obscure dicitur quae sacra polluta sunt," "The sacred rites which have been violated, is this matter not clearly stated?" would be absurd.

[18] If *ut* is relative, it must mean "in such a way as;" "in the way in which." Gaffiot, to be sure, is of a different opinion. He remarks, "(Quis) quid Relatif," *Rev. de phil.*, XXXIV (1910) 60, that when Latin says, *Video ut res gesta est*, "il envisage *ut* comme relatif; et nous le rendrons analytiquement par 'la manière dont.'" This view is opposed by the fact that, so far as I can find, in all the certain examples of the relative *ut*, except in stereotyped combinations like *praeut*, the meaning is not *la*

The last criterion must be used with caution. As language is often not logical, the value of this criterion depends upon the range of observation of the person who uses it. How cautious one must be, may be seen in the case of examples like Most. 459, Non potest Dici quam indignum facinus fecisti et malum. It might well seem that a *tam* in this passage would make no sense, and that, therefore, the *quam*-clause must be an indirect question. But observe the relative clause in Ter., Hec. 417, Non hercle verbis, Parmeno, dici potest Tantum quam reapse navigare incommodumst.[19] This clause resembles the one in Most., and it is, therefore, possible—though not probable—that in Most. a *tam* or *tantum* is to be supplied in thought.[20]

V. The Discrimination of the Indirect Question from the Condition[21]

There are a few examples of *si*-clauses which cannot possibly be anything else than indirect questions. These are known to be indirect questions for the following reasons.

(1) The occurrence, parallel to the *si*-clause, of an indirect question or equivalent construction, to which the *si*-clause is attached by means of a conjunction. Cf. Prop. II 34, 53: Harum nulla solet rationem quaerere mundi, Nec cur fraternis Luna laboret equis, Nec si post Stygias aliquid rest arbiter undas, Nec si consulto fulmina missa tonent. Cf. also, in later Latin, Greg. Passio Sept. Dorm. 7, 'Enarra, quaesumus, nobis, frater, quae hac nocte locutus est imperator, aut si inquisiti sumus, ut sciamus.' Alike whether the *quae*-clause is interrogative or relative, the *si*-clause used parallel to it must be an indirect question.

(2) The occurrence, following the *si*-clause, of an *an* or *necne* with which the verb of the *si*-clause is understood. Cf. Lygdamus

---

manière dont, but *de la manière dont, eo modo quo*. There are no examples of relative *ut* with a word like *modum* as its antecedent. If *ut* is ever relative in the combination *videre ut*, the meaning must be, "I see as (i.e., in the way in which)." Cf. *Ego video ut tu vides* (an imaginary example).

[19] *Quantum* for *quam* A. *reapse* Tyrrell: *re ipsa* codd.

[20] Cf. p. 55, n. 27.

[21] The term condition is here loosely used, to designate all *si*-clauses that are not indirect questions.

in Tibull. III, I, 19, Illa mihi referet, si nostri mutua curast, An minor, an toto pectore deciderim.

(3) The circumstance that the *si*-clause is in apposition with the subject or object of a verb of inquiry, or is used to explain a noun like *quaestio*. Cf. Livy XXXIV 3, 5, Nulla lex satis commoda omnibus est; id modo quaeritur, si maiori parti et in summam prodest. Cf. also Tert., Adv. Hermog. 27, cited p. 144.

(4) The fact that the main verb of the sentence cannot be used absolutely and needs the *si*-clause,—which in that case must be an indirect question—as its object. Cf. Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 28, "Non gustabo donec cognoscam, si miserebitur Deus huic homini, et si sit reputandus inter salvatos."[22] I can find, in the Thesaurus, no example of *cognosco* used absolutely, except in its technical, legal meaning.

(5) The circumstance that no kind of *si*-clause except an indirect question will yield the meaning demanded by the context. Cf. Ter. Hec. 321, Uxorem Philumenam Pavitare nescio quid dixerunt: id si forte est nescio. The meaning cannot be, "If it is that, I do not know it." Neither is Gaffiot's interpretation (cited p. 103) possible.

[22] This example, from Part II, is cited, because it illustrates the principle better than any of our earlier examples.

CHAPTER VIII

Clauses Which, if the Sole or Best Manuscript Tradition is Followed, are Certainly Indicative Indirect Questions[23]

I. Ask

28. Si.

The only absolutely certain examples of indicative indirect questions used after verbs meaning "ask" are *si*-clauses. After such verbs questions introduced by connectives other than *si* are, in the nature of the case, conceivably *directly quoted* questions. Cf. p. 89.[24]

Prop. II 34, 53: Harum nulla solet rationem quaerere mundi,
Nec cur fraternis Luna laboret equis,
Nec *si* post Stygias aliquid *rest* arbiter undas,
Nec si consulto fulmina missa tonent.[25]

This *si*-clause is conceded by Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 36, to be an indirect question. However, he prefers the reading *restaverit*.

Livy XXXIV 3, 5: Nulla lex satis commoda omnibus est; id modo quaeritur, si maiori parti et in summam prodest.

In this example, *id* must be filled out, and there is nothing to fill it out except the *si*-clause. If the *si*-clause supplements *id*, it can be interpreted in no other way than as an indirect question. This example was overlooked by Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, pp. 30 ff.

[23] It has been my endeavor to cite here only the absolutely certain examples. There are some clauses in earlier chapters which are practically certain instances of the indicative indirect question. Cf. p. 159.

[24] There are two exceptions to this rule (cf. p. 89, criterion 4 and p. 91, top), but I have found no instances in republican or Augustan Latin, which would come under these exceptions.

[25] *rest arbiter undas* Munro (*aliquis sedet arbiter* Jacob): *restabit erumpnas* L P (*erumpnas* om. N): *restaverit undas* D V: *restabitur* Phillimore: *restabimus* Wassenbergh: *restabit arenas* a scholar cited by Burmann.

II. Inform

1. Quid.

Plaut. Merc. 783:[26] Fortasse te illum mirari coquom
Quod venit atque haec attulit. Dicam id quid est.[27]

Ad Heren. I 6, 10: Quid alii soleant, quid nos facturi sumus, breviter exponemus.[27a]

Cic. Att. VII 12, 1: Sed quaeso ut scribas quam saepissime, non modo si quid scies aut audieris, sed etiam si quid suspicabere, maximeque *quid* nobis faciendum aut non faciendum *putas*.[28]

Gaffiot classes this example and the two examples following, as relative clauses. Cf. Appendix, pp. 191 ff.

Cic. Att. VII 26, 3: Quid habebo certi faciam ut scias.[29]

Att. XI 19, 1: Velim, quid erit, qualecumque erit, scribas.[30]

4. Quae, etc.

Har. Resp. 17, 37: Obscure dicitur, quae sacra polluta sunt?[31]

8. Qualis, etc.

Varro Reliquorum De Grammatica Librorum Fragmenta, p. 225 (Keil G. L. VII 29, 3): Qui transscribunt tabulas, non describunt, sed exscribunt; qui quales sunt scribunt, ii describunt.[32]

Tibull. II 4, 18: Ite procul, Musae, si non prodestis amanti:
Non ego vos, ut sint bella canenda, colo,
Nec refero solisque vias et *qualis*, ubi orbem
Complevit, versis Luna *recurrit* equis.[33]

[26] For this example, cf. Appendix, p. 199.
[27] *id quid* A: *quid* P. Becker (p. 245) suggests *id quod est.*
[27a] Thus Marx, with the *mutili* and d: *simus* b, l.
[28] Thus Gaffiot (*Pour le vrai latin*, p. 70) with the codd.: *putes* Lambinus, edd.
[29] Thus Gaffiot (p. 68) with the codd.: *quod* edd.
[30] Thus Gaffiot (p. 70), with Mediceus: *quidquid erit* or *si quid erit*, edd.
[31] *sunt* G E: *sint* other codd., edd.
[32] *sunt* codd.: *sint* Keil, edd.
[33] *recurrat* dett.

This is the only example in Tibullus of the indicative indirect question. Cf. Wolff, *De Enuntiatis Interrogativis*, p. 39.

10. Quantus, etc.

Plaut. Pseud. 1184: *Ha.* Quid maneam? *Ba.* Chlamydem hanc commemora quanti conductast. *Ha.* Quid est?

Becker (p. 169) emends. This is an example of illogical prolepsis. For illogical prolepsis cf. p. 87, n. 1.

Cic. Off. II 7, 23: Nec vero huius tyranni solum interitus declarat, quantum odium hominum valet ad pestem, sed reliquorum similes exitus tyrannorum.[34]

Livy XXII, 36, 1:[35] Quantae autem copiae peditum equitumque additae sunt, adeo et numero et genere copiarum variant auctores, ut vix quicquam satis certum adfirmare ausus sim.[36]

19. Quam.

Caecil. Statius, Ribbeck, II p. 42, 43: Nam quam duriter
Vos educavit atque asperiter, non negat.

Becker, p. 245, would change, with Bothe, to *educarit.*

23. Ut.

Plaut. Bacch. 720: *Ch.* Coctumst prandium?
Vos duo eritis atque amica tua erit tecum tertia?
Mn. Sicut dicis. *Ch.* Pistoclero nulla amicast?
Mn. Immo adest.
Alteram ille amat sororem, ego alteram, ambas Bacchides.
Ch. Quid tu loquere? *Mn.* Hoc, *ut futuri sumus.*

[34] *valeat* Mue. and other edd. Baiter-Halm n. cr.: "*valeat* c *valet* B H a b o."

[35] Livy XXXI 7, 8, contains an additional example of the indicative indirect question, if the manuscript reading is accepted. However, it seems to me that modern editors are probably right in inserting *aequabitis* and regarding the *quantum*-clause as an exclamation: Ne aequaveritis Hannibali Philippum, ne Carthaginiensibus Macedonas; Pyrrho certe aequabitis. "Aequabitis" dico? Quantum vel vir viro, vel gens genti praestat!

[36] *sunt* P C M: *sint* other codd., edd.

Capt. 236: Nunc ut mihi te uolo esse autumo.

The verb *autumare* sometimes introduces an indirect statement, as in Amph. 306, Quattuor viros sopori se dedisse hic autumat. Sometimes it has an object, as in Capt. 897, Si vera autumas. There are apparently no examples of *autumare* used absolutely, as *dicere* is used in Cic. Pro Milone 10, 29 (cited p. 63). Accordingly, the *ut*-clause in this example is not to be interpreted like the *ut*-clauses on pp. 63 ff., as possibly relative but more probably interrogative. If *autumare* is never used absolutely, this *ut*-clause *must* be an indirect question.

Plaut. M. G. 1289: Mitto iam ut occidi Achilles civis passus est.[37]

Prop. II 30, 29:
Illic aspicies scopulis haerere Sorores
Et canere antiqui dulcia furta Iovis,
Ut Semela *est* combustus, *ut est* deperditus Io,
Denique ut ad Troiae tecta volarit avis.

Prop. II 34, 36:
Nam rursus licet Aetoli referas Acheloi,
Fluxerit ut magno fractus amore liquor,
Atque etiam *ut* Phrygio fallax Maeandria campo
Errat et ipse suas *decipit* unda vias,
Qualis et Adrasto fuerit vocalis Arion
Tristis ad Archemori funera victor equus.

These and other examples from Propertius are rightly interpreted as indirect questions by Uhlmann, *De Sexti Properti Genere Dicendi* (Münster, 1909) p. 74.

28. Si.

Lygdamus in Tibull.

III 1, 19:
Illa mihi referet, si nostri mutua curast
An minor, an toto pectore deciderim.

Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 34, considers the *si*-clause a condition. But what, in that case, does "an minor" mean? It seems to me impossible to regard *si* as anything else than interrogative.

III. Find Out

4. Quae, etc.

Buecheler 73, 1 (CIL IX 1527): Hopes resiste et quae sum in monumento lege.

Mommsen, in CIL, comments: "litteris antiquis."

[37] 1287-1289 om. A.

28. Si.

Prop. III 5, 40: Tum mihi naturae libeat perdiscere mores,

. . . . . .

Sub terris sint iura deum et tormenta Gigantum,
Tisiphones atro *si furit* angue caput,
Aut Alcmaeoniae furiae aut ieiunia Phinei,
Num rota, num scopuli, num sitis inter aquas,
Num tribus infernum custodit faucibus antrum
Cerberus, et Tityo iugera pauca novem
An ficta in miseras descendit fabula gentis,
Et timor haud ultra quam rogus esse potest.

Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 37, acknowledges that this is an indirect question. He thinks that Propertius is using a Grecism (p. 39, *Le prétendu emploi*, p. 47).

IIIB. Observe

28. Si.

Vitruv. I 73, 17: Neque animadvertunt si quid eorum fieri potest necne.

Morgan, *On the Language of Vitruvius* 488, classes this example among "conditional protases used instead of indirect questions." However, *necne* clearly shows that the *si*-clause is an indirect question.

IIID. Determine, Judge

10. Quantus, etc.

Cic. Acad. Prior. II 15, 46: Adversatur enim primum, quod parum defigunt animos et intendunt in ea quae perspicua sunt, ut, *quanta* luce ea circumfusa *sunt* possint agnoscere.[38]

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

10. Quantus, etc.

Cic. Verr. Act II, I 8, 32: Intelligere debetis primum interesse utrum id onus vosmet ipsi reieceritis, an . . . vobis iudicandi potestas erepta sit; deinde etiam illud cogitare, *quanto* periculo venturi *sumus* ad eos

[38] *sunt* V A B, Orelli: *sint* other codd., Davies, Halm-Baiter, Mueller.

iudices, quos propter odium nostri populus Romanus de nobis voluerit iudicare.[39]

IV. Know

Becker has a theory that *scio* (pp. 256 ff.) and similarly *scin* (pp. 276 ff.) were sometimes used by Plautus like *nescio*, in close association with an interrogative pronoun, and without any influence upon the following verb. In this way he tries to account for the use of the indicative mood in some of the examples cited below: e.g., Aul. 174. This theory does not seem to me to square with the facts. Indeed, Becker himself acknowledges (p. 258) that in questions depending upon *scio* Plautus appears "certas leges non observasse." Cf., against Becker's theory, Morris in *A. J. P.*, X (1889), p. 412.

1. Quid.

Plaut. Aul. 174: Scio quid dictura's: hanc esse pauperem: haec pauper placet.

Bacch. 78: Scio quid ago. *Pi.* Et pol ego scio quid metuo.

Merc. 431: *De.* At ego—. *Ch.* Quin ego, inquam—. *De.* Ah nescis quid dicturus sum, tace.[39a]

M. G. 36: Scio iam quid vis dicere.

Truc. 862: Scio mecastor quid vis et quid postules et quid petas.[40]

Ter. Adel. 996: Tibi, pater, permittimus:
Plus scis quid opus factost.[41]

Publilius Syrus, Ribbeck II, p. 339, 348: Magis valet qui nescit quid valet calamitas.[42]

[39] *sumus* G 12ζ (according to Halm-Baiter), *simus* other codd., edd.

[39a] *sim Ital.*, favored by Becker, p. 219.

[40] *uis* cod., Lindsay: *uelis* Camerarius, Ritschl, Leo, G.-S.

[41] Thus Σ: *sit* D ^{1}L: *quod opus factost* Fleckeisen, Becker (p. 254), Tyrrell (with comment: "Post *quid* potius sequeretur coniunctivus"): *Quid facto opus sit* Dziatzko-Kauer (ed. 1903).

[42] *quod* F, Wölfflin, Ribbeck.

Cic. Att. I 19, 4: Metellus est consul sane bonus et nos admodum diligit; ille alter nihil ita est, ut plane quid erit nesciat.[43]

Att. X 12, 4: Servium exspecto, nec ab eo quicquam ὑγιές. Scies quid erit.[44]

Cat. II 3, 5: Atque hoc etiam sunt timendi magis, quod quid cogitant me scire sentiunt, neque tamen permoventur.[45]

Ov. Her. VII 53: Quid, si nescires, insana quid aequora possunt?
Expertae totiens tam male credis aquae?[46]

Met. X 637: Dixerat, utque rudis primoque cupidine tacta,
Quid facit ignorans amat et non sentit amorem.[47]

Livy XLI 24, 5: Nos autem qui nec ob quam causam necquemadmodum perierit Demetrius scimus, nec quid Philippus, si vixisset, facturus *fuerat*, ad haec, quae palam geruntur, consilia nostra adcommodare oportet.[48]

2. Quis.

Plaut. M. G. 925: *Pal.* Num ille te nam novit? *Acr.* Numquam vidit:
Qui noverit me quis ego sum?[49]

4. Quae, etc.

Varro L. L. V 31, 140: Plaustrum ab eo quod non ut in his quae supra dixi, sed omni parte palam est, quae in eo vehuntur, quod perlucet, ut lapides, asseres, tignum.[50]

[43] Thus Gaffiot, *Pour le vrai latin* 71, with the two editions of the fifteenth century: *quid emerit* edd., following Cratander. See Gaffiot's note. Tyrrell-Purser n. cr.: "*quidem* (vel *quid*) *erit* (vel *est* vel *sit*) codd."

[44] *quid* M, Gaffiot, *op. cit.* 69: quicquid W C, edd.

[45] *quid cogitant* a o Lg. 50, 53, 57: *quidquid cogitant* e, Halm-Baiter: *quidquid cogitent* d w: *quid cogitent* other codd., Lambinus.

[46] *possint* E s.

[47] *Quid facit* O X, Merkel, Magnus: *quod facit* dett.

[48] Thus Drakenborch: *fuerit* Weissenborn-Heraeus.

[49] *sum* B D: *sim* C, edd.

[50] Thus Goetz-Schoell with codd. Spengel n. cr.: "scrib. vid. aut *vehantur* aut *palam sunt*."

Cic. Fam. XIV 5, 1: Iam enim me ipsum exspectas sive nos ipsos, qui quidem quam primum ad vos venire cupimus, etsi, in quam rem publicam venimus, intellego.[51]

5. Qui (Nominative Singular Substantive; cf. p. 56, n. 29).

Plaut. Pseud. 263a: *Ps.* Nosce saltem hunc quis est. *Ba.* Iam diu scio

Qui fuit: nunc *qui* is *est* ipsus sciat.[52]

Becker, p. 310, interprets *qui fuit* as relative: "Mente supple: scio eum talem, qui." This seems to me impossible.

19. Quam.

Caelius in Cic. Fam. VIII 15, 1: Si scias quam sollicitus sum, tum hanc meam gloriam, quae ad me nihil pertinet, derideas.[53]

23. Ut.

Plaut. Stich. 112: Edepol, pater,
Scio ut oportet esse, si sint ita ut ego aequom censeo.

Cic. Att. III 7, 3: Quem quidem ego nec quo modo visurus nec ut dimissurus sum, scio.[54]

28. Si.

Ter. Hec. 321: Uxorem Philumenam
Pavitare nescio quid dixerunt; id si forte est nescio.

Pamphilus and his slave Parmeno are about to enter Pamphilus' house. At vs. 315 they hear a noise of people bustling about within. Pamphilus expresses his apprehension. Then Parmeno speaks the words cited above. The meaning is clearly: "I don't know whether it is perhaps that [i.e., a shivering fit of Philumena's] which causes the excitement." Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 21, rejects this simple interpretation, as given in the edition

[51] *veniamus* Lambinus, Mue., other edd.: *venimus* codd. (according to Purser), Gutsche (*De Interrogationibus Obliquis apud Ciceronem*, p. 112), Gaffiot (p. 24).

[52] *qui is est* Ritschl: *qui sit ipse* A: *qui estis ipsus* P: *quis* Camerarius: *quis est ipsus*<*se*>Lindsay. Becker, p. 253, would read *quis is sit.*

[53] *sim* Mue. and other edd.: *sum* M, Boeckel ("Epistulae Selectae," [Heidelberg, 1908]).

[54] *sim* Mue. and other edd. Purser n. cr.: "*sim* s *sum* codd. cett."

of Thomas, in favor of the following impossible one: "Parmeno . . . a domino . . . cui mens est vehementer sollicita, interrogatus, incerta consulto respondet, quo melius impetum declinet: 'pavitare nescio quid dixerunt'; statimque, qui culpa non vacare se senserit, iterando inscientiam confirmare studet: 'id,' hoc est, 'eum pauorem nescio'; atque adeo, ut se dubitanter loqui planius etiam significet, illam sententiam interponit 'si forte est.'"

VI. See

4. Quae, etc.

Ad Heren. IV 9, 13: In mediocri figura versabitur oratio . . . sic: Quibuscum bellum gerimus, iudices, videtis: cum sociis, qui pro vobis pugnare . . . soliti sunt.[55]

10. Quantus, etc.

Cic. Fam. VII 4: Vides enim, quanto post una futuri sumus.[56]

19. Quam.

Cic. Fam. VI 9, 2: Quam mihi necesse est eius salutem et fortunas quibuscumque rebus possim tueri, vides.[57]

30. Various Connectives.

Varro, L. L. X 2, 9: Quare quae et cuius modi sunt genera similitudinum ad hanc rem, perspiciendum ei qui declinationes verborum proportione sintne quaeret.[58]

VII. Concern

4. Quae, etc.

Varro R. R. II 5, 9: Et praeterea quibus regionibus nati sunt refert.[59]

The total number of the certain examples of the indicative indirect question may appear small. But cf. p. 96, note 23.

[55] Müller n. cr.: "*geramus* editores, Langen Phil. 37, p. 405." Langen n. cr. "Solus Monasteriensis veram scripturam servavit, quae est *geramus*." Marx, (p. 37), thinks that the superior readings which Langen quotes from the codex Monasteriensis are "coniecturae . . . doctorum medii aevi."

[56] *simus* Mue. and other edd. Purser n. cr.: "*simus* Vict. *sumus* M R." Gutsche (p. 112) quotes indicative. Skutsch, *Glotta* III 366, remarks that the clausula supports the indicative.

[57] Thus Gaffiot, *Pour le vrai latin* 38, with the codd.: *sit* Lambinus, edd.

[58] *sint* Spengel.

[59] *sint* Keil, Goetz: *sunt* codd.

CHAPTER IX

Preliminary Conclusion

There are found, in the Latin of the republican and Augustan periods, a large number of indicative clauses which are most naturally interpreted as indirect questions. Further, there occur a smaller, but still considerable, number of clauses which, if the sole or best manuscript tradition is followed, must unquestionably be interpreted as indicative indirect questions.

CHAPTER X

The Disposal of the Indicative Indirect Question by Emendation

When an apparent example of the indicative indirect question cannot possibly be interpreted as a direct question, an exclamation, a relative clause, or anything else than an indirect question, emendation is often resorted to. Cf. p. xviii, n. 7; p. xix, n. 11; p. xxi, n. 14; critical notes *passim*.

It is true that frequently a very slight change will dispose of an instance of the indicative indirect question. In many an example nothing more is necessary than to make such an easy substitution as that of *sint* for *sunt*. Again, the reading of *quod* in place of *quid* will often change an indirect question into a relative clause. Cf., e.g., the passages cited on pp. 101 ff. Indeed, a large number of the examples of the indicative indirect question might, without any very violent changes, be transformed into subjunctive indirect questions or into relative clauses.

However, there are some passages among our certain examples of indirect questions, which, for metrical reasons, cannot possibly be emended, or at least cannot be emended without violence. Such passages are Plaut. Stich. 112 (p. 103); Pseud. 1184 (p. 98); Ter. Hec. 321 (p. 103); Prop. II 30, 29 and II 34, 36 (p. 99).[1] These passages alone, it seems to me, establish beyond the possibility of doubt, the existence of the indicative indirect question in Latin.

Confirmatory evidence of the use of the indicative mood in indirect questions is found in inscriptions. To be sure, there seem to be no instances of this use in inscriptions of the republican period. I

[1] Similarly, the rhythm of a prose passage may support the indicative reading. In Cic. Att. II 10 and Fam. VII 4 the indicative, as Skutsch has pointed out, yields a better clausula than the subjunctive would do. See pp. 15 and 104. For the clausulae involved, cf. Zielinski, *Der constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden* (Leipzig, 1914) 652 (clausula V 2) and 739 f. (S 2). One should, however, be cautious about using clausulae as criteria for the text-criticism of Cicero's letters. So far as I am aware, the rhythm of these letters has not been subjected to the careful study which has been devoted to the rhythm of the orations.

have not found any in Volume I of the *Corpus*. Since, however, there are only two examples, so far as I have observed, of the *subjunctive* indirect question—CIL., I, 1220 and 1479—the absence of the indicative construction is not significant. In inscriptions of the empire, the indicative indirect question occurs not infrequently. Examples taken from various collections are cited in this paper. I have read the *Monimentum Ancyranum* in search of indirect questions, but I have found no examples either of the indicative or of the subjunctive construction. The inscriptions of Pompeii, Stabiae, and Herculaneum in CIL., IV and X—which I singled out for reading because their *terminus ante quem* is fixed—furnish two examples of the subjunctive indirect question—CIL., IV Suppl. 4971 and 5242—and none of the indicative. Buecheler, however, cites an example from Pompeii of an indicative indirect question (Buecheler 932, from *Notizie dei Scavi*; see below, p. 129). W. S. Fox, "The Johns Hopkins Tabellae Defixionum," *Supplement to A. J. P.*, XXXIII 1 (1912), p. 42, says that he finds only one example of the indirect question in the *Defixiones*. He cites this on p. 17, l. 27. A lacuna renders it uncertain whether the indicative or the subjunctive was used.

In view of the occurrence of instances of the indicative indirect question, which it would be impossible to "emend," one should, it seems to me, be very cautious about "emending" examples of this construction, even when a change would be easy. One should not change *quid* to *quod*, or *sunt* to *sint*, for the sake of disposing of an example of the indicative indirect question. To be sure, *quid* and *quod*, and *sunt* and *sint* have often been confused by scribes. Nevertheless, while some instances of *quid* with the indicative may be due to a copyist's mistaking the sign for *quod*, and some instances of *sunt* may be due to a similar error, yet in all probability the instances in which *sunt* has been changed to *sint*, or *quid* to *quod*, in clauses of the kind which we are studying, are more numerous than the instances in which the contrary changes have been made. Because the subjunctive was the more usual mood in indirect questions (see p. 169) a scribe would be more apt to make the mistake of copying an indicative as a subjunctive, than to commit the opposite error.[2] Similarly,

[2] Cic. Rep. I 19, 31 (cited p. 12) seems to be an example of a scribe's miscopying or wilfully changing an indicative indirect question. Here the false subjunctive was

he would be more apt to copy a *quid* introducing an indicative indirect question as *quod*, than *vice versa*. As regards *intentional* changes, it is hardly conceivable that a subjunctive in an indirect question should ever have been purposely changed to an indicative.

It may be argued that at any rate in particular classes of writings the certain examples of the indicative indirect question are so very rare as to make emendation permissible. It is true that the scholar who emends the few examples of the indicative indirect question that occur in the formal prose-writings of Cicero, may conceivably be restoring what Cicero wrote.[3] In all probability, however, this is not the case. As was remarked above, an original indicative in an indirect question would be more apt to be changed by a scribe to a subjunctive, than *vice versa*. Since the existence of the indicative indirect question outside of the formal prose-writings of Cicero is certain, it seems arbitrary to emend the few instances within those writings. Schmalz does not go far enough, it seems to me, when he remarks, p. 516, that editors should retain indicative indirect questions "in all den Schriften, auch der klassischen Zeit, welche der Volkssprache nahe stehen." Cf. the similar remark in Kühner-Stegmann II, §227, 6 b. Indicative indirect questions should, generally speaking, be retained *wherever* they occur. There is no reason, apart from tradition, for objecting to this construction. Furthermore, it seems to me that, where manuscripts vary between the indicative and the subjunctive in indirect questions, the indicative should be preferred. The principle of the *lectio difficilior* is to be followed, and, unless the manuscript tradition very markedly favors the subjunctive reading, the indicative reading is to be adopted. So I should keep the indicative in Cic., De Orat. II 60, 243,[4] where Wilkins, following 32, prints *quales sint*:

corrected back to the indicative, so that we find in the manuscript *intellegis*. There is a similar instance in Cic. Tusc. I 13, 29, in cod. G (cf. p. 26). The fact that the latter example appears in our manuscripts of Saint Augustine with the subjunctive (cf. p. 26) and that an indicative indirect question in Virgil, Georg. I 57 is quoted with the subjunctive in our Seneca manuscripts (cf. p. 40) seems to be a further illustration of the tendency to substitute the more usual for the less usual construction. This is true whether the misquotations are the fault of scribes or of Augustine and Seneca themselves.

[3] For the examples cf. p. 160, note 6.

[4] The clause may conceivably, but less naturally, be interpreted as relative.

"Ergo haec duo genera sunt eius ridiculi, quod in re positumst: quae sunt propria perpetuarum facetiarum, in quibus describuntur hominum mores et ita effinguntur, ut aut re narrata aliqua *quales sunt* intellegantur aut imitatione breviter iniecta in aliquo insigni ad irridendum vitio reperiantur."

In Manil. IV 919 I should, similarly, read the indicative:

"Atque adeo faciem caeli non invidet orbi
Ipse deus vultusque suos corpusque recludit
Semper volvendo seque ipsum inculcat et offert,
Ut bene cognosci possit doceatque videntis,
Qualis erat cogatque suas attendere leges."

erat mss. except m; *eat* m, edd.

Erat is an instance of the use of the imperfect tense to express the discovery of a state of affairs existing before (cf. Hale-Buck, §486, 1).

To be sure, there is a large number of passages in which some manuscripts have the indicative and others the subjunctive in indirect questions, but in which the subjunctive is to be preferred. See Appendix II.

PART II—A SUPPLEMENTARY STUDY OF THE CONSTRUCTION IN LATER LATIN

CHAPTER I

Indeterminate Examples: Indirect or Direct Questions

I. Questions whose Interpretation is Indifferent

I. Ask

1. Quid.

Petron. 55, 3: Trimalchio 'rogo' inquit 'magister, quid putas inter Ciceronem et Publilium interesse.'[1]

II. Inform

1. Quid.

Martial III 30, 2: Sportula nulla datur; gratis conviva recumbis:
Dic mihi *quid* Romae, Gargiliane *facis*.
Unde tibi togula est et fuscae pensio cellae?
Unde datur quadrans? Unde vir es Chiones?[2]

Tert. Car. Chr. 3 (p. 894 Oehler): Quid tanti fuit edoce, quod sciens Christus quid esset id se quod non erat exhiberet?

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Petron. 67, 2: Sed narra tu mihi, Gaie, rogo, Fortunata quare non recumbit.

18. Quando.

Martial V, 58, 2: Cras te victurum, cras dicis, Postume, semper.
Dic mihi cras istud, Postume, *quando venit*.
Quam longe cras istud, ubi est? Aut unde petendum?
Numquid apud Parthos Armeniosque latet?

[1] *putes* L O.
[2] *dic*] *quid* C [A].

II. Questions Which are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect than as Direct

1. *Questions More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect, than as Direct and Not Quoted.*

I. Ask

1. Quid.

Rutil. Lup. II 6: Haec si praesens agit, ut dixi, res publica, quid animi estis habituri quaero.[3]

4. Quae, etc.

Enno. 262, 23: Quaero cui me servavit usus ille frugalior, si aequi observantia patrum meretur offensas.

II. Inform

1. Quid.

Greg. Virt. S. Iul. 33 (p. 578, 8): Quid de eius reliquiis in Oriente fidelium fratrum relatio signat, edicam.

Greg. Virt. S. Mart. II 32 (p. 620, 29): Quid ergo nuper actum est, multos in testimonium exhibens declarabo.[4]

Enno. 206, 36: Dic . . . quid praeter te spei erat residuum.

2. Quis.

Sen. Agam. 414: Effare casus quis rates hausit meas,
Aut quae maris fortuna dispulerit duces.[5]

Leo, in his note on this passage, Vol. I, p. 93 of his edition, remarks that *quis hausit* is clearly an indirect question. Certainly it would be extremely forced to consider this clause as a direct question followed by a shift to an indirect question (cf. p. 11, criterion 5).

4. Quae, etc.

Asconius, In Cornelianam 56: Res autem tota se sic habet: in qua quidem illud primum explicandum est, de quo Metello hoc dicit.[6]

[3] R. Stephanus changes to subjunctive.

[4] quod 2, p.

[5] *quis fare nostras* (vestras ψ) *hauserit casus rates* A. *dispulerat* Bothe.

[6] *dicat* Kiessling-Schoell.

It is not natural to interpret: "This must first be explained: concerning what Metellus did he say this?"

Enno. 246, 1: Sine dissimulatione docete quae geritis.[7]

13. Cur.

Martial III 95, 3: Numquam dicis have, sed reddis, Naevole, semper,
Quod prior et corvus dicere saepe solet.
Cur hoc expectas a me, rogo, Naevole, dicas:
Nam puto nec melior, Naevole, nec prior es.[8]

25. Num.

Gellius 18, 7, 2: Quaeso, inquit, te, magister, dicas mihi num erravi quod cum vellem δημηγορίας Latine dicere, contiones dixi.

30. Various Connectives.

Greg. Virt. S. Mart. II 40 (p. 624, 3): Cui ille: "Dic mihi, quaeso, domine, quis es vel quod est nomen tuum."

Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae (Huebner) 219 (Martin, p. 34): Quis quantusve fuit Samson . . .
Personat Esperio.

Personat seems to demand the interrogative clause as its object. It would be practically impossible to interpret the question as direct.

III. Find Out

30. Various Connectives.

Persius III 67: Discite et, O miseri, causas cognoscite rerum:
Quid sumus et *quidnam* victuri *gignimur*, ordo
Quis datus aut metae qua mollis flexus et unde,
Quis modus argento, quid fas optare, *quid* asper
Utile nummus *habet*, patriae carisque propinquis
Quantum elargiri deceat, *quem* te deus esse
Iussit et humana *qua parte* locatus *es* in re.

[7] *geretis* B.

[8] *exspectas* A^a C^a: *exspectes* B^a.

It would be extremely forced to regard the indicative clauses as anything else than indirect questions.

IIIB. Observe

27. An.

Jer. In Gal. III ad 5, 13: Diligenter attende an ex consequentibus sensus iste texitur.[9]

IIID. Determine, Judge

26-27. Utrum . . . an.

Aug. Civ. Dei. VIII 3: Non mihi autem videtur posse ad liquidum colligi, *utrum* Socrates, ut hoc faceret, taedio rerum obscurarum . . . ad aliquid apertum . . . reperiendum animum *intendit* . . . an vero . . . *nolebat* immundos terrenis cupiditatibus animos se extendere in divina conari.[10]

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

23. Ut.

Lucan II 682: Pompeius tellure nova conpressa profundi
Ora videns curis animum mordacibus angit,
Ut reserat pelagus spargatque per aequora bellum.[11]

The *ut*-clause is not a question of fact, but a question of deliberation. If the reading of M_1, is correct, the indicative and the subjunctive are used side by side in the same construction. Probably the clause is an indirect question of deliberation, depending upon *angit*. It would be less natural to interpret it as a direct question: "How shall he . . .?" For indicative questions of deliberation, cf. the comment on Plaut. Epid. 274 (p. 12).

[9] var. *texatur*.

[10] *intenderit* p v, Dombart: *intenderet* C q: *intendit* A K F and the other codd.

[11] *reserat* M_1: *referat* Z_1: *reseret* other codd., Hosius.

IV. KNOW

1. Quid.

Jer. C. Vig. 5: Quid est "illud nescio quid" scire desidero.

Aug. Conf. I 13, 20: Quid autem erat causae cur Graecas litteras oderam quibus puerulus imbuebar, ne nunc quidem mihi satis exploratum est.

2. Quis.

Lucan I 126: Nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarve priorem
Pompeiusve parem. *Quis* iustius *induit* arma,
Scire nefas; magno se iudice quisque tuetur:
Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni.

26-27. Utrum . . . an.

Amm. Mar. XVI 11, 12: Quae utrum ut vanus gerebat, . . . an mandatu principis . . . nefanda multa temptabat . . . latuit.

27. An.

Sen. Nat. Quaest. V 18, 12: Unde scio an nunc aliquis magnae gentis in abdito dominus . . . non contineat intra terminos arma, an paret classes ignota moliens? Unde scio, hic mihi *an* ille ventus bellum *invehet?*[12]

Apul. Met. VI 5, 391: Qui scias an etiam quem diu quaeritas illic in domo matris repperies?[13]

Greg. Hist. Fr. II 9 (p. 74, 15): Cum autem eos regales vocet, nescimus, utrum reges fuerint, an in vices tenuerunt regnum.[14]

In the last seven passages it is highly improbable that the questions are direct.

[12] *invehat* Madvig, Gercke.

[13] *repperies* F: *reperias* v, *repperias* Helm.

[14] *tenuerint* A 1 C 1.

V. Hear

1. Quid.

Sen. Dial. VII 25, 1: *Quid* ergo *est* quare illas non in bonis numerem et quid praestem in illis aliud quam vos, quoniam inter utrosque convenit habendas, audite.[15]

Haase places an interrogation-point after *est.*

Greg. Hist. Fr. V 43 (p. 234, 26): Audi quid Iesus deus noster, cum ad resuscitandum venit Lazarum ait.[16]

Hist. Fr., VI 40 (p. 280, 15): Absculta quid e caelis loquitur.

VI. See

11. Quot.

Claud. Mam. De Statu Animae, Epilogus (p. 192, 22): Nunc etiam videamus quot genera sunt corporum.

26. Utrum.

Vegetius IV 3, 9: Quod utrum bene opinantur usus viderit.[17]

It would be very forced to interpret this question as direct.

27. An.

Tert. Virg. Vel. 9: Videamus nunc an . . . praescripta de muliere in virginem spectant.[18]

2. *Questions More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect, than as Directly Quoted.*

I. Ask

1. Quid.

Sen. Dial I 1, 1: Quaesisti a me, Lucili, quid ita, si providentia mundus regeretur, multa bonis viris mala accidere.[19]

[15] *est* codd.: *sit* Lipsius, Vahlen.

[16] *quod*, changed by the same hand to *quid*, B 2.

[17] *opinentur* Gesner, Schneider, Lommatzsch.

[18] *spectent* codd. tres Vaticani.

[19] *acciderent* E.[1]

Lucan IX 563:

Tua pectora sacra
Voce reple; durae saltem virtutis amator
Quaere quid est virtus, et posce exemplar honesti.

Enno. 232, 20:

Caelestis dispensatio facienda suggerit, si quid amor optat inquiras.

Buecheler 1136, 1 (C I L VI 9693):

Quid sibi volt, quaeris, tellus congesta, viator?

2. Quis

Greg. Hist. Fr. VIII 13 (p. 333, 4):[20]

Ait: 'Patruus tuus, o rex, diligenter interrogat, *quis* te ab hac promissione *retraxit*, ut sacerdotes regni vestri ad concilium, quod simul decreveratis, venire differrent.'[21]

4. Quae, etc.

Sen. Ep. Mor. VI 6, 18:

Tertium genus est eorum quae proprie sunt: innumerabilia haec sunt, sed extra nostrum posita conspectum. *Quae sunt* interrogas? Propria Platonis supellex est.[22]

Buecheler 222, 7 (C I L X 4183; a very late inscription):

Si nomen queres, qui leges,
Mensem priorem cogita.
Si *qui fecerunt* queritas,
Parentes dixi, sufficit.

Greg. Hist. Fr. X 16 (p. 427, 13):[20]

Exemplar Iudicii . . . evocatis partibus, interrogata Chrodieldis vel Basina, *quare* tam audacter contra suam regulam, foribus monasterii confractis, *discesserant*, et hac occasione congregatio adunata discessa sit.[23]

[20] For the shift in person cf. p. 25, criterion 4.
[21] *traxit* A 1.
[22] *sint* P Pr. a r B.
[23] *discesserint* A 1, D 5; *discessirent* B 1.

10. Quantus, etc.

Martial VI 88:[24] Mane salutavi vero te nomine casu
Nec dixi dominum, Caeciliane, meum.
Quanti libertas *constat* mihi tanta requiris?
Centum quadrantes abstulit illa mihi.[25]

12. Quotus, etc.

Lucan VIII 170: Rectoremque ratis de cunctis consulit astris,
Unde notet terras, quae sit mensura secandi
Aequoris in caelo, Syriam quo sidere servet,
Aut *quotus* in plaustro Libyam bene *dirigit* ignis.[26]

It would be extremely forced to understand this example as showing a shift from indirect to direct quotation.

23. Ut.

Val. Flac. VII 120: Quaerit ut Aeaeis hospes consederit oris
Phrixis, *ut* aligeri Circen *rapuere* dracones.

The parallel use of a subjunctive indirect question favors the interpretation of the indicative clause as an indirect question. Furthermore, a directly quoted question, "How did the dragons carry Circe away"? would be absurdly naïve.

27. An.

Martial III 32, 1:[27] An possum vetulam quaeris, Matronia: possum
Et vetulam, sed tu mortua, non vetula es.[28]

Aug. Serm. LXVI, 3:[27] Quaeris an ego sum?

VIII. Wonder

13. Cur.

Stat. Theb. IV 333: Sunt omina veri:
Mirabar, *cur* templa mihi tremuisse Dianae
Nuper et inferior voltu dea visa, sacrisque
Exuviae *cecidere* tholis; hoc segnior arcus
Difficilesque manus et nullo in vulnere certae.

It would seem even more harsh to interpret the last example as a relative clause than as a directly quoted question.

[24] For the shift in person cf. p. 25, criterion 4.

[25] Lindsay n. cr.: "*constat* A^a: *constet* B^a (sed *constat* L ante corr.): *constet* (E A C G) vel *constat* (X B) C^a."

[26] *dirigit* M_1, V Z_1; *dirigat* other codd., Hosius.

[27] For the shift in person cf. p. 25, criterion 4.

[28] Thus A^a: *non possum* B^a C^a. Edd. read subj. or use quotation marks.

CHAPTER II

Indeterminate Examples: Indirect Questions or Exclamations

I. Clauses whose Interpretation is Indifferent

VI. See

30. Various Connectives.

Stat. Theb. I 188: Cernis ut erectum torva sub fronte minetur
Saevior adsurgens dempto consorte potestas,
Quas gerit ore *minas*, *quanto premit* omnia fastu.
Hicne umquam privatus erit?

It is possible that a new sentence, an exclamation, begins with *quas*.

II. Clauses Which are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Exclamations

II. Inform

4. Quae, etc.

Stat. Theb. XII 805: Non ego, centena si quis mea pectora laxet
Voce deus, tot busta simul vulgique ducumque,
Tot pariter gemitus dignis conatibus aequem:
Turbine quo sese caris impleverit audax
Ignibus Euhadne fulmenque in pectore magno
Quaesierit; quo more iacens super oscula saevi
Corporis infelix excuset Tydea coniunx;
Ut saevos narret vigiles Argia sorori;
Arcada *quo* planctu genetrix Erymanthea *clamat*,
Arcada, consumpto servantem sanguine vultus,
Arcada, quem geminae pariter flevere cohortes.[1]

It would be possible to begin a new sentence, an exclamation, at line 805, but it seems more natural to regard this verse as an indirect question.

[1] *clamat* P: *clam*$^{e}_{a}$*t* B1Q2; *clamet* other codd., Klotz.

10. Quantus, etc.

Greg. Vit. Patr. VI (7) (p. 685, 21): Iam vero in exsequiis eius quantus planctus, quanti populi adfuere, enarrari vix potest.

Other examples are: Vit. Patr. VIII (10) (p. 700, 5): Virt. S. Mart. I 36 (p. 605, 25).

Enno. 107, 4: Quantum tunc, admirande pontifex, tua plus egit absentia, quantum imperavit humilitas deprehensa, dicant illi quos de exulibus ditissimos reddidisti.

III. Find Out

10. Quantus, etc.

Enno, 106, 26: Quantum acutior fuit verborum quam ferri lammina, hinc, lector, agnosce.

Enno. 129, 21: Quantum apud me pondus est perlatoris advertite.

30. Various Connectives.

Greg. Hist. Fr. VI 40 (p. 280, 1): Nam tu, qui Paulo apostolo derogas, et sensum eius non intellegis, percipe *quam* caute *loquitur*, et iuxta ut recepere quis potest, averte *qualiter praedicat* inter gentes incredulas, ut nullo *onos* grave videatur imponere.

IIID. Determine, Judge

1. Quid.

Greg. Virt. S. Mart. I 22 (p. 600, 8): Deliberataque ab omni inpedimento lingua, beati Martini miraculum populis testabatur, dicens: "Ecce, *quid* in hac nocte sanctus Dei operatus *est*, me teste, probate!'

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

8. Qualis, etc.

Greg. Hist. Fr. X 1 (p. 407, 26): Pensate ergo, qualis a conspectu districti Iudicis pervenit, cui non vacat flere quod fecit.[2]

[2] *veniat* A 1.

9. Qualiter.

Greg. Glor. Conf. 20 (p. 760, 4): Et praesertim rememoramini librum vitae beati Martini et recolite *qualiter* verba sacrata promenti de capite globus ignis egressus, usque ad caelos visus *est* conscendisse.

It would be very forced to interpret the last two examples as exclamations.

30. Various Connectives.

Marcus Aurelius (Fronto, Ad M. Caesarem et invicem III 19, p. 56, 16): Qualem mihi animum esse existimas, quom cogito quam diu te non vidi, et quam ob rem non vidi?

A. Ebert, "De Syntaxi Frontoniana," *Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis* II (1881), p. 347, says: "Interrogatio directa, ubi ratio interrogationem indirectam cum coniunctivo desiderat." He cites two passages as parallel. The one, Ad Verum I 1, p. 114, 22, by Fronto, is probably a direct question; the other, by Verus, is cited on p. 157. It seems very forced either to interpret the clause under consideration as Ebert does, or to regard it as a quoted exclamation. The natural interpretation is that the clause is an indirect question.

V. Hear

1. Quid.

Claud. Mam. De Statu Animae 1, 6 (p. 42, 12): Saepe dicimus: vide quid sonat, cum sonus ad auditum pertineat, non ad visum, nec tamen ita dicimus audi quid lucet.

VI. See

1. Quid.

Claud. Mam. De Statu Animae I, 6 (p. 42, 11), just cited.

Greg. Hist. Fr. VI 40 (p. 280, 7): Adverte potius cautelam eius et vide astutiam, quid aliis dicit quos robustiores videbat in fide.[3]

Greg. Glor. Mart. 105 (p. 561, 6): Tamen vide quid agit idem doctor.[4]

Greg. Virt. S. Mart. I 28 (p. 602, 3): Ecce quid, sancte, praestas fidelibus, qui tua moenia expetunt proprie.

4. Quae, etc.

Stat. Theb. XII 260:

Cernis quo praedita cultu,
Qua stipata manu, iuxta tua limina primum
Oedipodis magni venio nurus?

Buecheler 457, 2 (CIL XI 4311): Tu quicumque legi[s ti]tulum nostrum nomenque requiris
Aspice quo fato raptus mihi spiritus or[e] est.

Enno. 234, 21: Ecce vide qua mecum arte contendis.

9. Qualiter.

Com. Instr. I 31, 1 Intuite dicta Salomonis . . . .
. . . qualiter vos ille detractat.

Greg. Glor. Conf. 49 (p. 777, 20): Ait: "Vae mihi, qui in amaritudine cordis maledixi huic arbori. Ecce enim qualiter aruit."

10. Quantus, etc.

Juv. V 67: Ecce alius quanto porrexit murmure panem
Vix fractum, solidae iam mucida frusta farinae,
Quae genuinum agitent, non admittentia morsum.

Greg. Glor. Mart. 105 (p. 560, 31): Vides ergo *quantum distat* inter conversationem caelestem et opolentiam saecularem, *quantum distat* inter martyrum divitias et saeculi pompas; vides qualia martyribus sint conlata praemia ad vitae religiosae conpendia.

[3] *dicit* om. A 1.
[4] Thus 3.

Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 23 (p. 839, 29): "Videte, dilectissimi, quantum praevalet inimicus, nam Trofime propter pudicitiam damnaverunt scorto."[5]

Cor. Iust. I 181: Aspice quanta fuit nostrae simul urbis et orbis
Provida cura seni.

11. Quot.

Sil. It. Pun. II 348: Indole non adeo segni sumus. Aspice, turmae
Quot Libycae *certant* annos anteire labore
Et nudis *bellantur* equis. Ipse, aspice, ductor,
Cum primam tenero vocem proferret ab ore,
Iam bella et lituos ac flammis urere gentem
Iurabat Phrygiam atque animo patria arma
movebat.

19. Quam.

Sen. De Ben. II 29, 1: Vide quam iniqui sunt divinorum munerum aestimatores et quidem professi sapientiam.[6]

Sen. Herc. Fur. 1299: Ecce quam miserum metu
Cor palpitat pectusque sollicitum ferit.

Buecheler 1489 (CIL II 4426): Aspice quam subito marcet quod floruit ante,
Aspice quam subito quod stetit ante cadit.
Nascentes morimur finisque ab origine pendet.

Buecheler 1839, Rossi museo Pio-Lateranense tabula 23: Respice quam parbus cubat hic sine felle palumbus
Dum luce est ista frunitus.

[5] *praevalet* 1 (3).

[6] Thus codd., Hosius: *sint* earlier edd.

Claud. Mam. De Statu Animae I 9 (p. 49, 18): Cernis quam facile indoctae figmentum praesumptionis evanuit, praeterquam innumera super hoc argumentari promptissimum est.

It would be extremely harsh to interpret this *quam*-clause otherwise than as an indirect question.

Enno. 197, 3: Sed vide per rerum providentiam quam cauta est seniorum dispensatio et fabricatis plena sermonibus.

23. Ut.

Sil. Ital. XIII 446: Interea cerne ut gressus inhumata citatos
Fert umbra et properat tecum coniungere dicta.[6a]

Buecheler 369, 1
Cernis ut orba meis, hospes, monumenta locavi
Et tristis senior natos miseranda requiro.

30. Various Connectives.

Apul. Met. V 9, 337: Vidisti, soror, quanta in domo iacent et qualia monilia, quae praenitent vestes, quae splendicant gemmae, quantum praeterea passim calcatur aurum.

It would be extremely harsh to interpret *quanta . . . aurum* otherwise than as indirect questions.

Tertullian, Ad Uxorem I 8: Vide quam ex aequo habetur qui viduae benefecerit, quanti est vidua ipsa, cuius assertor cum domino disputabit.[7]

Greg. Glor. Conf. 96 (p. 809, 20): Ecce *quales quantasque* suis *congregat* divitias mundi paupertas, ut eis non solum quae voluerint Redemptor, qui cuncta ex nihilo condidit, tribuat, verum etiam ipsa eis elementa iubeat famulari.

[6a] *fert* OV: *est* L F.

[7] *habeatur* BC.

Glor. Conf. 108 (p. 818, 17): Ecce quid tribuit elymosina. Ecce quales thesauros sanctis suis, qui se in pauperibus dilegunt, Deus indulget.

VIII. Wonder

9. Qualiter.

Greg. Vit. Patr. VII (4) (p. 689, 27): Admirabile est enim et illud miraculum, qualiter beatum corpus eius, cum post multa tempora transferretur, apparuit gloriosum.

Greg. De Cursu Stellarum 16 (p. 863, 5): Septimum est enim miraculum, qualiter luna in ter quinis diebus vel crescit ad integritatem vel ad exiguitate minuitur.[8]

It would be very forced to interpret the last two examples otherwise than as indirect questions.

[8] *minuitur* 2 (3): *minuatur* 1.

CHAPTER III

Indeterminate Examples: Indirect Questions or Relative Clauses

I. Clauses whose Interpretation is Indifferent

II. Inform

4. Quae, etc.

Apul. Met. I 5, 24: Quod ibidem passim per ora populi sermo iactetur quae palam gesta sunt.

Helm changes to *iactet*. Prescott in *Class. Phil.* X 358 says that "*iactetur* is quite possible with ellipsis of *de eis*." On Prescott's interpretation the *quae*-clause is relative. It might equally well, it seems to me, be considered an indirect question. Cf. the subjunctive indirect question in Lucan IV 201, cited p. 128.

Apul. Met. III 3, 178: Rem denique ipsam et quae nocte gesta sunt cum fide proferam.

Met. VIII 1, 505: Sed ut cuncta noritis, referam vobis a capite, quae gesta sunt quaeque possent merito doctiores, quibus stilos fortuna subministrat, in historiae specimen chartis involvere.

Met. VIII 14, 545: Et enarratis ordine singulis, quae sibi per somnium nuntiaverat maritus quoque astu Thrasyllum inductum petisset, ferro sub papillam dexteram transadacto corruit.

Helm, who punctuates thus, apparently considers the *quae*-clause an indirect question. It would be possible to punctuate: "Singulis quae . . . maritus, quoque . . .," and to interpret: "When everything that her husband reported had been related, and it had been related by what craft she had enticed Thrasyllus and attacked him. . . ."

Apul. Met. XI 25, 808: Nec mihi vocis ubertas ad dicenda quae de tua maiestate sentio, sufficit.

Apul. Apol. 42: Memini me apud Varronem . . . hoc etiam legere: Trallibus de eventu Mithridatici belli magica percontatione consultantibus puerum in aqua simulacrum Mercuri contemplantem quae futura erant CLX versibus cecinisse.

Asconius, In Milonianam 39: Cognovi . . . Munatium in contione exposuisse populo quae pridie acta erant in senatu.

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Ter. Andr., Alter Exitus Suppositicius 6: Id quam ob rem non volui eloquar.

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

4. Quae, etc.

Apul. Met. III 13, 196: Abiectus in lectulo meo, quae gesta fuerant, singula maestus recordabar.

IV. Know

4. Quae, etc.

Petron, 8, 2: Si scires, inquit, quae mihi acciderunt.

V. Hear

4. Quae, etc.

Statius Theb. V 734: Audite, o ductor Nemeae lectique potentes Inachidae, quae certus agi manifestat Apollo.

Amm. Mar. XIV 11, 15: Nullam videndi vel audiendi quae ferebant furari potuit facultatem.

Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 24 (p. 840, 40): Nunc autem, si audierit quae mihi contigerunt, blasphemat Deum tuum.

VI. See

4. Quae, etc.

Sen. De Clem. I 13, 3: Qui ubi circumspexit *quaeque fecit quaeque* facturus *est* et conscientiam suam plenam sceleribus ac tormentis adaperuit, saepe mortem timet, saepius optat, invisior sibi quam servientibus.[1]

II. Clauses Which are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Relative Clauses

I. Ask

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Sen. Controversiae II 5, 14: Quaeris quare non peperit?

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Jer. In Naum. ad 2, 1: Quaeritur quomodo eversa est iniuria Iacob.

13. Cur.

Enno. 21, 20: Si quaeras cur silentio vestro multata non reticet prodiga frons pudoris.

21. Unde.

Hermerus Mulom. Chironis 191: Item rationem huius morbi, unde nascitur, inquirere debemus.

II. Inform

1. Quid.[2]

Petron. 76, 11: Tantum quod mihi non dixerat quid pridie cenaveram.

Priscian, Keil II, p. 421, 20: Indicativus, quo indicamus vel definimus, quid agitur a nobis, vel ab aliis.

Priscian, Keil II, p. 423, 25: Indicativus autem dicitur quod per eum indicamus quid agitur.

[1] *quae fecit* S: om. A.

[2] For the examples with *quid* cf. App. 200.

Greg. Glor. Conf. 8 (p. 753, 25): Velim, o sonipes, si tibi os Dominus, uti quondam fecit asinae, reseraret, diceris, quid vidisti spectabile, ut non incederes.

4. Quae, etc.

Quint. Inst. IV 5, 26: Et divisa autem et simplex propositio . . debet esse . . . brevis nec ullo supervacuo onerata verbo; non enim quid dicamus, sed de quo dicturi sumus ostendimus.[3]

Lucan IV 201: Extrahit insomnis bellorum fabula noctes,
Quo primum steterant campo, quae lancea dextra
Exierit.[4]

For the possibility that the *quo*-clause is relative, cf. p. 125. The parallel use of the subjunctive clause, *quae . . . exierit* renders it almost certain that the indicative clause is an indirect question.

Gellius 9, 2, 5: Quaeso autem te, cum bona venia dicas mihi quibus nos uti posse argumentis existimas, ut esse te philosophum noscitemus.

Greg. Hist. Fr. IX 2 (p. 359, 22): Quae autem ibi ipsa die virtutes apparuerunt, vel qualiter fuerit funerata, in libro miraculorum plenius scribere studui.

Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 22 (p. 838, 35): "Surge et enarra nobis quae tibi contigit."[5]

Enno. 109, 4: Quae ibi fuerunt flumina lacrimarum, quanti planctus, silebo.

Enno. 270, 17: Ostendi post oris ferias quae tibi per aurium callem divitiae commearunt.

Cor. Io. VIII 207: Docet quae prima salutis
Causa fuit.

[3] *sumus* A B: *simus* other codd., Radermacher.
[4] *steterant* M_1 VPU_1; *steterint* other codd., edd.
[5] *contigerint* 1, 2, 5: *contigerunt* 3.

Aetheria Peregrinatio XII (p. 18, 11): "Si vultis videre loca, quae scripta sunt in libris Moysi, accedite foras hostium ecclesiae et de summitate ipsa, ex parte tamen ut possunt hinc parere, attendite et videte. Et dicimus uobis singula, *quae sunt* loca haec, quae parent."

5. Qui (Masculine Singular Substantive; cf. p. 56, n. 29).

Pliny N.H. XXXVII (38) 119: Adscribitur et qui primus tinxit.

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Amm. Mar. XIV 10, 13: Ut . . . ostendam qua ex causa omnes vos simul adesse volui . . . accipite . . . quae succinctius explicabo.

Amm. Mar. XIV 11, 21: Compulsuri eum singillatim docere quam ob causam quemque . . . necatorum iusserat trucidari.

Buecheler 932, 2 (Notizie d. Scavi 1882, p. 436 . . . Pompeis in posticae pariete.): Miximus in lecto. Fateor, peccavimus, hospes, Si dices quare nulla matella fuit.

Hermerus Mulom. Chironis 352: Cuius et rationem ego protinus reddam, quare . . . insanabilis est.

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Sen. Suasoriae I 10: Hic dixit incerta peti . . .; hic matrem de qua dixit quomodo illa trepidavit etiam quom Granicum transiturus esset.[6]

Sen. Ep. Mor. XX 4, 21: Si tamen exigis, dicam quomodo omne animal perniciosa intellegere conatur.

[6] Adolph Kiessling (ed. Leipzig, 1872) puts: after *de qua dixit*, and adopts W. Mueller's change of *esset* to *esses*, thus interpreting the clause as a directly quoted exclamation.

Columella IX 3, 4: Nam saepe morbis intercipiuntur, quibus quemadmodum mederi oportet suo loco dicetur.

Tert. Adv. Praxean 2 end: Quo modo numerum sine divisione patiuntur procedentes tractatus demonstrabant.

Vopiscus, Hist. Aug. XXIX 8, 9: Nihil illis opto, nisi ut suis pullis alantur, quos quem ad modum fecundant, pudet dicere.

Aetheria V (p. 10, 14): Ostenderunt etiam quemadmodum per ipsam vallem unusquisque eorum abitationes habuerant.

Aetheria VIII (p. 14, 16): Dixit nomen ipsius arboris quemadmodum appellant eam Grece.

Aetheria XLV (p. 52, 6): Et illud etiam scribere debui, quemadmodum docentur hi qui baptidiantur per pascha.

For the last example especially, owing to the *illud*, the interpretation of the dependent clause as interrogative is almost inevitable.

Hermerus Mulom. Chironis 38: Qua ratione singula vitia inuri debent, primum demonstro.

10. Quantus etc.

Apul. Met. II 22, 145: Nec satis quisquam definire poterit quantas latebras nequissimae mulieres pro lubidine sua comminiscuntur.

Enno. 113, 5: Qui non potest quantus est una tractatuum forma monstrari.

For these two examples, compare p. 55, n. 27. In the Apul. passage, the *satis* makes it especially difficult to supply, in thought, *tantas*.

11. Quot.

Asconius, In Cornelianam, 62 (p. 71, 2): Quo loco enumerat, cum lex feratur, quot loca intercessionis sunt.[7]

[7] *sunt* codd.: *sint* Sigonius, Clark.

20. Ubi.

Enno. 209, 32: Taceo ubi tibi iniuncta est pax diuturna.

21. Unde.

Aug. Conf. V 8, 14: Et hoc unde mihi persuasum est, non praeteribo confiteri tibi.

Amm. Mar. XIX 4, 1: Quae genera morborum unde oriri solent breviter explicabo.

30. Various Connectives.

Lucilius Aetna 220: Nunc quoniam in promptu est operis natura solique,
Unde ipsi venti, *quae res* incendia *pascit*,
Cur subito *cohibentur*, iners quae causa silenti,
Subsequar.[8]

Vopiscus, Hist. Aug. XXVI, 26, 4 (a letter of Aurelian): Dici non potest quantum hic sagittarum est, qui belli apparatus, quantum telorum, quantum lapidum.

For the possibility that the *quantum*-clause is relative, see p. 55, n. 27.

IIB. Discuss

1. Quid.[9]

S. C. Vellaeanum a. 46 (e Dig.), Bruns p. 194: Quod M. Silanus et Vellaeus tutor cos. verba fecerunt de obligationibus feminarum quae pro aliis reae fierent, *quid* de ea re fieri *oportet*, de ea re ita censuere.

III. Find Out

1. Quid.

Amm. Mar. XIV 10, 15: Tamquam arbitros vos quid suadetis operior.

Amm. Mar. XVI 12, 18: Experieris quid miles . . . efficiet.

[8] *pascat* Matthiae. *cur* G: *cum* the other codd.

[9] For the possibility that the *quid*-clauses are relative, cf. App. p. 200.

Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 24 (p. 840, 18): Oportet hunc resuscitari, ut cognoscamus quid in eum adversarius est operatus.[10]

Hermerus, Mulom. Chironis 984: Si quod iumentum . . . doluerit, diligentius eum tractato, ut scias quid ei dolet.

Enno. 275, 24: Rogo ut quid circa te agitur tabellarum promulgatione cognoscam.[11]

Enno. 291, 22: Rogo ut quid in causa vestra de Roma nuntiatur agnoscam.[12]

4. Quae, etc.

Quint. Inst. IV 5, 1: Quod ea fiat causa lucidior et iudex attentior ac docilior, si scierit et de quo dicimus et de quo postea dicturi simus.[13]

Huebner, Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae 255 (Martin p. 34): Omnis conventus . . . conoscat q(u)orum . . . veneratur reliquias.

Greg. Hist. Fr. III 31 (p. 135, 12): Hic verc cum dedicisset quae meretrix ista commiserat, qualiter propter servum, quem acceperat, in matrem extiterit parricida. . . .[14]

Cor. Io. I 103: Noscere quae saevi fuerant discrimina belli.

IIIB. Observe

1. Quid.[15]

Festus 219 (Lindsay p. 208): Observasse dicitur qui observat quid cuiusque causa facere debet.[16]

[10] *quae* 2, 3, 4a.

[11] *agatur* Sirmond (ed. 1611).

[12] *nuntietur* Sirmond.

[13] Thus A(Baehrens, "Beiträge," p. 525, says correctly; he calls it "Variatio beim Rel."): *sumus* the other mss., Radermacher.

[14] *cummiserat* B2. *extiterat* A1, C1: *extitirit* B1: *extiteret* B2: *stiteret* B4.

[15] For the examples with *quid* cf. App. p. 200.

[16] *debet* W: *debeat* X, ed. princ., Lindsay.

IIID. Determine, Judge

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Jer. Ep. 22, 10: Ad exemplum horum poteris tibi ipsa colligere quomodo primus de paradiso homo . . . in hanc lacrimarum deiectus est vallem.

18. Quando.

Terentius Scaurus in Varro, Reliquorum de Grammatica Librorum Fragm., p. 223 (Keil Gram. Lat. VII 29, 3): Quando ergo ex, quando e dici oportet, ex consequentibus vocabulis animadvertitur.[17]

30. Various Connectives.

Tert. Praescr. 22 (end): Sed nec ecclesiam se dicant defendere, qui quando et quibus incunabulis institutum est hoc corpus probare non habent.

Aug. Civ. Dei V 12 (Dombart 214, 22): Unde intellegi potest quem finem volebant esse virtutis et quo eam referebant qui boni erant, ad honorem scilicet.

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

13. Cur.

Apul. Apol. 16: Etiam illa ratiocinatio necessaria est, cur in planis quidem speculis ferme pares optutus et imagines videantur, in tumidis vero et globosis omnia defectiora, at contra in cavis auctiora; ubi et cur laeva cum dexteris permutentur; quando se imago eodem speculo tum recondat penitus, tum foras exerat; *cur* cava specula, si exadversum soli retineantur, appositum fomitem *accendunt*; qui fiat ut. . . .[18]

[17] *oportet* B (the most trustworthy cod.; cf. Keil VII, p. 6): *oporteat* P, edd.

[18] *vid*$^{q}_{e}$*nt̃* (em. ead. m.) F. *accendunt* Fφ: *accendant* Bosscha, Helm.

Cur . . . accendunt is naturally interpreted as an indirect question, like the subjunctive clauses preceding and following it.

15. Quo.

Sen. Dial. I 4, 4: Avida est periculi virtus, et quo tendit, non quid passura sit, cogitat, quoniam etiam quod passura est gloriae par est.[19]

18. Quando.

Tert. Praescr. 8 (beginning): Quando hanc vocem, dominus emisit, recordemur.

20. Ubi.

Com. Instr. I, 33, 8: Nec respicis ubi moraris.

IV. Know

1. Quid.[20]

Amm. Mar. XIV 7, 14: Quid rerum ordo postulat, ignorare dissimulantem. . . .

Aug. Serm. CCXXXVI 3: Nescio quid ibi erit.

4. Quae, etc.

Hyginus 167 (20, 16): Ut scias quae voluptas est cum deo concumbere.

This example is taken from M. Tschiassny, *Studia Hyginiana* (Vienna, 1888) p. 23, n. 50. Tschiassny remarks, "In interrog. obl., quarum modum recte in universum Hyginus adhibuit coniunctivum, praeter titulos fabularum quos nescio an ab eo profecti non sint, semel a recta norma declinavit," and cites this passage.

Sen. Ep. Mor. I 4, 8: Lex autem naturae, scis quos terminos nobis statuit?[21]

Sen. De Paupertate 4, 10: Lex autem naturae, scis quos terminos nobis statuit?

[19] *tendat* edd.

[20] For the examples with *quid*, cf. App. p. 200.

[21] *statuat* R ϵ o, Fickert.

Martial IX 92, 1: Quae mala sunt domini, quae servi commoda nescis,
Condyle, qui servum te gemis esse diu.[22]

Apul. Met. V 31, 379: Tunc illae non ignarae, quae gesta sunt, palpare Veneris iram saevientem sic adortae.

For the possibility that the dependent clause in this example is relative, cf. p. 53, criterion 3.

Tert. Ad Nationes I 1: Scio plane qua responsione soletis . . . convenire.

Amm. Mar. XX 8, 17: Scio . . . quas rerum acerbitates . . . concordia . . . meliorem revocavit in statum.

Greg. Hist. Fr. X 3 (p. 411, 13): Dicens: "Hodie apparebit, cui Divinitas obtenere victoriam praestit."[23]

Enno. 83, 19: Scitis optime quae a vobis et per me et ore proprio sanctus pater vester dominus episcopus postulavit.

Enno. 100, 14: Scis quae te pollicebaris acturum.

Enno. 211, 6: Meministis, socii, cuius ad haec loca commeastis imperio.[24]

Hermerus Mulom. Chironis 567: Cum nodum fecerit, regulas solves die primo L. Deinde tunc scies quo tempore nodum faciet, et unctionibus uteris donec ad sanitiem perducas.

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Sen. Ep. Mor. XIX 7, 7: Scis quare non possumus ista? Quia nos posse non credimus.

Haase punctuates: "Scis quare? Non possumus. . . ."

Jer. In Ephes. Pr.: Per quos [sc., divinos libros] et Deum discimus et quare nati sumus non ignoramus.

[22] *sunt* A^a C^a: *sint* B^a.

[23] *praestitit* A 1: *praestat* corr.: *praestit* C 1: *praestabit* D5.

[24] *commeassites* B^1: *commeassetis* B^2.

CIL II 6130 (Martin p. 34): Quare mortuus sum nescio.

Hermerus Mulom. Chironis 451: Curato et hoc utique scire, ex qua causa haec vitia nascuntur, quam numquam nemo scripsit.[25]

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Apul. Met. I 25, 78: Iam enim faxo scias quem ad modum sub meo magisterio mali debent coherceri.[26]

Hermerus Mulom. Chironis 352: Quemadmodum intelligere quis possit, qua ratione succurrere huic vitio nemo potest.

20. Ubi.

Lucan VIII 645: Nescis, crudelis, ubi ipsa
Viscera sunt Magni; properas atque ingeris ictus,
Qua votum est victo.[27]

Com. Instr. II 15, 13: Iam scitis ubi demersit.

21. Unde.

Com. Instr. I 24, 7: Unde processisti nescis nec unde nutriris.

V. Hear

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Apul. Met. IX 30, 650: Accipe igitur, quem ad modum homo curiosus iumenti faciem sustinens cuncta, quae in perniciem pistoris mei gesta sunt, cognovi.

Aug. Conf. V 14, 24: Cum enim non satagerem discere quae dicebat, sed tantum *quemadmodum dicebat* audire . . ., veniebant in animum meum simul cum verbis, quae diligebam, res etiam, quas neglegebam.

[25] Oder n. cr.: "*sciret.*"

[26] *debeant* Helm, with n. cr.: "*debeo* (φ) *debēt* eff. al. m. em. v." Prescott, review of Helm, *Class. Phil.* X 358, asks: "Why not *debent?*"

[27] *sint* V P G Q Z.

VI. See

4. Quae, etc.

Tiberianus II 18 (Baehrens, Unedierte lat. Gedichte p. 31): Denique cernamus, quos aurum servit in usus. Auro emitur facinus, pudor almus venditur auro.

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Sen. Controversiae X 2, 1: Videtis quemadmodum in hoc quoque iudicio opera sua iactat.

Tert. Adv. Hermog. 45 (Oehler, p. 865): Vides ergo quemadmodum operatione dei universa consistunt.

30. Various Connectives.

Aug. Civ. Dei V 12 (Dombart I, p. 211, 13): Proinde videamus quos Romanorum mores et quam ob causam Deus verus ad augendum imperium adiuvare dignatus est.

Aug. Civ. Dei X 5 (Dombart I, p. 408, 22): Intueamur quem ad modum, ubi Deum dixit nolle sacrificium, ibi Deum ostendit velle sacrificium.

Aug. Serm. XXII 9: Nam videte quomodo incantat adversus Goliam.

IX. It is Incredible

4. Quae, etc.

Amm. Mar. XIV 6, 22: Nec credi potest, qua obsequiorum diversitate coluntur homines sine liberis Romae.

X. No Verb Expressed

4. Quae, etc.

Cato Agr. Cult. XIII: In torcularium in usu quod opus est.

Agr. Cult. CXLII: Vilici officia quae sunt.[28]

For this word-order in indirect questions, cf. p. 49, note 19. The above examples are parallel to chapter headings with the subjunctive mood. Cf., e.g., chapters 10 and 11.

Celsus II 7: Ex quibus notis singula morborum genera cognoscuntur.

Celsus II 8: Quae notae spem salutis, quae pericula ostendunt.

6. Qua Causa, etc.

Val. Max. 8, 1: Infames rei quibus de causis aut absoluti aut damnati sunt.[29]

7. Quo Modo.

Cato Agr. Cult. X: Quo modo oletum agri iugerum CCLX instruere oportet.

Cato Agr. Cult. XI: Quo modo vineam iugerum C instruere oportet.

Becker, p. 312, considers these clauses relative.

30. Various Connectives.

Hermerus Mulom.

Chironis 256: De capitis valetudinibus, quae et quomodo et a quibus rebus accedent.

[28] *sint* b.

[29] *sunt* L, *sint* Kempf.

CHAPTER IV

Indeterminate Examples: Indirect Questions or Conditions[1]

I. Clauses Whose Interpretation is Indifferent

III. Find Out

Petron. 33: "Amici," ait, "pavonis ova gallinae iussi supponi et mehercules timeo ne iam concepti sint; temptemus tamen si adhuc sorbilia sunt."

Sen. Tro. 811: Si quid hic cineris latet,
Scrutabor ore.[2]

In these two examples, *si* may mean either "whether" or "in case."

II. Clauses Which are More Naturally Interpreted as Indirect Questions than as Conditions

I. Ask

Tert. Pud. 13 (near end): Et de hoc enim quaeratur, si spiritus hominis ipsius salvus erit.

It would seem to me extremely forced to interpret this example, or either of the two that follow, as anything else than an indirect question. The Gregory passage, for instance, would not naturally be interpreted: "Make inquiry, in case (or on the chance that) the boys . . . have come."

Aus. Ep. XII 40: Quin et require si sinet
Tenore fari obnoxio.

Delachaux, *La latinité d'Ausone* (Neuchatel, 1909) p. 109, regards the clause as an indirect question.

[1] The term "condition" is loosely used in this subdivision, to designate all *si*-clauses that are not indirect questions.

[2] *quidquid hic* A.

Greg. Glor. Mart. 77 (p. 540, 15): Exclamat suis: "Inquirite si pueri quos Nemauso direximus iam venerunt."

II. Inform

Sen. Oed. 211: Germane nostrae coniugis, fessis opem
Si quam reportas, voce properata edoce.

Tert. Apol. 6 (beginning): Respondeant . . . si a nullo desciverunt, si in nullo exorbitaverunt.

Com. Instr. I 37, 10: Dicant si iussum est deos adorare.

Sulp. Sev. Dial. II 11, 3: Dic mihi, inquit, si umquam in bello fuisti, si in acie constitisti.

IIID. Determine, Judge

Tert. Apol. 13 (beginning): Recognoscite si mentior.[3]

Tert. Ad Mart. 2: Ipsam interim conversationem saeculi et carceris comparemus, si non plus in carcere spiritus acquirit quam caro amittit.

Com. A. 487: Si . . . sunt veri, probemus.

Aus. Lud. 104: Tum iudicandum si manet felicitas.

Delachaux, *La latinité d'Ausone*, p. 109, interprets the clause as an indirect question. It would be practically impossible to interpret it in any other way.

V. Hear

Columella VIII 5, 14: Animadvertat, an pulli rostellis ova pertuderint, et auscultetur, si pipiant.[4]

The *si*-clause appears to be parallel to the *an*-clause. It would not be natural to interpret it as a loosely attached condition: "in case (or on the chance that) they are peeping."

[3] *si mentiar* some codd. (see Oehler *ad loc*).

[4] See Schneider *ad loc.*

VI. See

Columella, IX 1, 7: Itaque custos vivarii frequenter speculari debebit, si iam effoetae sunt.[5]

Petron. 71: Inscriptio quoque vide diligenter si haec satis idonea tibi videtur.

Tert. Virg. Vel. 6 (beginning): Videamus nunc si apostolus formam vocabuli istius secundum Genesim observat.[6]

Tert. Idol. 24 (end): Viderimus enim si corvus . . . in ecclesia erit.

Apul. De Deo Socr. XXIII 173: Neque enim in emendis equis phaleras consideramus et baltei polimina inspicimus et ornatissimae cervicis divitias contemplamur, *si* ex auro . . . monilia variegata *dependent*, *si* . . . ornamenta . . . collo *circumiacent*, *si* frena caelatà, *si* ephippia fucata, *si* cingula aurata *sunt*. Sed . . . equum ipsum nudum et solum corpus eius et animum contemplamur, ut sit et ad speciem honestus et ad cursuram vegetus et ad vecturam validus: iam primum in corpore si sit argutum caput . . .; praeterea *si* duplex *agitur* per lumbos spina.

Aug. Civ. Dei. XVII 20 (II, p. 237, 29 Domb.): Videamus ergo si sermones illius veri sunt et temptemus quae eventura sunt illi et sciemus quae erunt novissima illius.

Aug. Serm. XLV 6: Videte si potest dici.

Serm. LII 13: Videamus si filius quidem animam suam posuit, et ei animam suam pater reddidit.

Greg. Vit. Patr. XX (4) (p. 743, 29): Ait ad eum: 'Egredere foris et aspice, si iam, celebrata solemnia, populus de missis egreditur.'

All the examples under "See" can only by forcing be interpreted otherwise than as indirect questions.

[5] *sint*, Schneider, with note: "*Effoetae sunt* Sangerm, pro *sint*."

[6] *observat* A B C: *observet* the other codd.

CHAPTER V

Indeterminate Examples: Miscellaneous

VI. See

23. Ut.

Stat. Silv. IV I, 25: Aspicis ut templis alius nitor, altior aris
Ignis et ipsa meae tepeant tibi sidera brumae,
Moribus atque tuis *gaudent* turmaeque tribusque
Purpureique patres, lucemque a consule ducit
Omnis honos? Quid tale, precor, prior annus habebat?

It is possible that, as Klotz punctuates, a new sentence, a statement, begins at vs. 25.

29. Ne.

Apul. Apol. 85 (Helm, vol. 2, I p. 94, line 7, marked †): Tune, quid in cubiculo agat, perquiris, ne mater tua non dico amatrix, sed ne omnino femina est.

Aug. Civ. Dei I 28: Interrogate fideliter animas vestras, ne forte de isto integritatis et continentiae vel pudicitiae bono vos inflatius extulistis et humanis laudibus delectatae in hoc etiam aliquibus invidistis.

In each of these examples *ne* apparently means "whether . . . not" (cf. Draeger, §464) and introduces an indirect question. To be sure, it can be understood as meaning "lest" and introducing a clause of fear. The latter interpretation, however, will not make it easier to explain the mood use. The mood use can be most easily accounted for on the assumption that certain *ne*-clauses of fear, with the subjunctive mood, came to be felt as indirect questions ("lest" coming to mean "whether . . . not"), and that then the indicative mood came to be occasionally used in such clauses. This development may have taken place as early as the time of Lucilius. See Lucil.

604. A corruption of the text makes the reading uncertain. Hoppe, *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian*, p. 72, remarks that in Tertullian the subjunctive is always used in such clauses. For indirect questions with *ne* in the Itala and the Vulgata, cf. Rönsch, p. 401.

CHAPTER VI

Examples Which, if the Sole or Best Manuscript Tradition is Followed, are Certainly Indicative Indirect Questions

I. Ask

26. Utrum.

Asconius In Cornelianam 54: In hac causa tres sunt quaestiones, prima . . . utrum certae aliquae res sunt ea lege comprehensae quibus solis reus maiestatis teneatur, quod patronus defendit; an libera eius interpretatio iudici relicta sit, quod accusator proponit.[1]

28. Si.

Tert. Adv. Hermog. 27: Quaestio est, si erat terra.

Jerome Ep. 48, 14: Ego timide quaero si bonum est mulierem non tangere.

Greg. Glor. Mart. 105 (p. 560, 13): Post cuius exsequias sacerdotes qui aderant puellae eius familiari interrogant, quid de tanta fecisset pecunia, aut si ea eroganda temporis sui permisit spatium.

II. Inform

1. Quid.

Buecheler 984, 2 (CIL IX 5041, I R N 6141): Quid tua commemorem, nimium crudelis, iniqua
Fletus et casus quid facis immeriteis?

[1] om. P. ed V. alii. *sunt* S M: *sint* Kiessling-Schoell. The passage is bracketed by Clark.

Iulius Capitolinus Hist. Aug. V 9, 10: De quo bello quidem quid per legatos barbarorum pacem petentium, *quid* per duces nostros *gestum est*, in Marci vita plenissime disputatum est.[2]

Greg. Glor. Mart. 105 (p. 560, 20): Et clerici . . . episcopo quid actum fuerat indicant.

Greg. Virt. S. Mart. I 23 (p. 600, 15): Dignum exaestimavi et illud non omittere in relatu, quid Wiliacharium presbiterum referentem audivi.[3]

4. Quae, etc.

Aug. Civ. Dei II 6: Dicatur in quibus locis haec docentium deorum solebant praecepta recitari.

7. Quo Modo, etc.

Apul. Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας V 268: Nunc dicendum est, quemadmodum quattuor illae propositiones inter se affectae sunt.[4]

Vegetius V 15, 1: Quibus modis constrictus venter solvi debet, saepius edictum est.[5]

8. Qualis, etc.

Tert. Cult. Fem. I 2: Haec qualis sunt . . . pronuntiari potest.[6]

Enno. 99, 3: Iam si illa retexam, quas inimicorum sustinuit insolentias, quibus laboravit immissionibus, *quali* procellas pessimorum virtute *contempsit*. . . .

The *qualis*-clause is certainly an indirect question, and the *quae*-clauses are in all probability instances of this construction.

Le Blant 3[c] (from Pirson, p. 212): Qualis honore nites hic pietate probes.

[2] *quidem* B P M: *quidem quid* Peter.
[3] *qui* 3.
[4] *sunt* G C and other codd: *sint* Thomas.
[5] *debeat* Schneider.
[6] *sunt* B C Laurentianus: *sint* reliqui.

Le Blant 708 (from Pirson, p. 212; end of sixth century): Sic ostendit planctibus qualem duxit com coniuge vita(m).

Buecheler 1000, 2: Hic est ille situs, qui qualis amicus amicis,
Quaque fide vixit, mors fuit indicium.

Greg. Hist. Fr. II 13 (p. 80, 23): Qualis autem fuerat hic pontifex, testatur Paulinus dicens:[7]

Hist. Fr. V 7 (p. 199, 1): Sed et illud commemorare libet, qui vel quales viri hoc anno a Domino sunt vocati.

Virt. S. Mart. IV 29 (p. 656, 25): Dicit mihi, quale beneficium domni Martini senserat.

9. Qualiter.

Com. A. 543: Iam qualiter iterum resurrexit supra notavi.

Greg. Hist. Fr. III Prologus (p. 108, 13): Omittamus autem, qualiter illam [i.e., Trinitatem] Abraham veneratur ad elicem, Iacob praedicat in benedictionem, Moyses cognuscit in sentem, populum sequitur in nubem eandemque paviscit in montem, vel qualiter eam Aaron portat in logium, aut David vaticinatur in psalmum.

Other examples with *qualiter* are: Hist. Fr. IV 12 (p. 149, 21); V 49 (p. 240, 6); X 19 (p. 433, 10); Virt S. Mart. II 2(p. 610, 9); II 16 (p. 614, 12); Virt. S. Iul. 31 (p. 577, 6); Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 1 (p. 828, 22); Glor. Conf. 20 (p. 759, 12) and 58 (p. 781, 25); Vit. Patr. IX (p. 700, 2).

[7] *fuerit* A1, B4, 5, C1.

10. Quantus, etc.

CIL VI 6435 (Stolz-Schmalz, p. 517): Quantum fuit carus, declaravit supremus dies.

The date is doubtful; perhaps it lies between 36 B.C. and 44 A.D. Cf. CIL VI, p. 995.

Buecheler 1381, 13 (Rossi, Inscr. Christ. Rom. II, p. 310; Pirson, p. 212): Cuius quanta viri mundo sapientia fulsit,
Venturi saecli gloria testis erit.

11. Quot.

Sen. Herc. Oet. 365: Dilecta Priami nempe Dardanii soror
Concessa famula est; adice quot nuptas prius,
Quot virgines dilexit; erravit vagus.

17. Quatenus.

Claud. Mam. De Statu Animae I 19 (p. 69, 1): Quatenus anima nec quantitati subiacet disseramus.

19. Quam.

Sen. Nat. Quaest. II 53, 3: Fortasse enim libebit ostendere, quam omnia ista a philosophia parente artium fluxerunt.[8]

Greg. Virt. S. Mart. I 34 (p. 604, 37): De qua cera quam multae virtutes factae sunt super frigoriticis et aliis infirmis, longum est enarrare.

27. An.

Sen. Thy. 772: Nec facile dicam, corpora an flammae magis
Gemuere.

28. Si.

Tert. Car. Chr. 18: Si ex carne factum est verbum caro, aut si ex semine ipso factum est, scriptura dicat.

[8] *fluxerunt* codd., Baehrens (*Beiträge* 521): *fluxerint* H. J. Mueller, Symb. I 5, Gercke.

Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 4 (p. 829, 17): "Dic, puer, *si* vera *sunt* ista quae mater tua prosequitur." At ille tacebat. Iterum atque iterum proconsul interrogabat et nihil respondit.

A similar example is in Glor. Conf. 5 (p. 751, 14). The meaning of the present example is clearly not: "Speak, boy, in case these things are (prove to be) true." The only possible alternative to regarding the *si*-clause as an indirect question is to consider it a direct question. Bonnet's remark, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, p. 676, that *si* "ne peut servir à l' interrogation directe" is not correct. Cf. App., p. 204. However, there seem to be no clear examples in Gregory of direct questions with this particle.

Greg. Passio Sept. Dorm. 7 (p. 850, 23): "Enarra, quaesumus, nobis, frater, quae hac nocte locutus est imperator, aut si inquisiti sumus, ut sciamus."

30. Various Connectives.

Tert. Ad Mart. 6 (end): Praesentia nobis tempora documenta sint, quantae qualesque personae inopinatos . . . exitus referunt.

Com. A. 59: Quid Deus in primis vel qualiter singula fecit, Iam Moyses docuit.

Aug. Conf. V 9, 16 (p. 86, 8): Non enim satis eloquor quid erga me habebat animi, et quanto maiore sollicitudine me parturiebat spiritu, quam carne pepererat.

Claud. Mam. De Statu Animae I 19 (p. 69, 9): Nec dicimus quantus est, quia non mole magnus est, nec quid habet, quia nihil non habet, nec quo modo est, quia ipse modus est.

31. Connectives Uncertain.

Buecheler 450 a, 9 (CIL VIII 218) (as restored):

Tu ni sc[i]s quantis vita[m d]eduxerit annis,
A me non disces. Titulu[s ti]bi talia dicat
Voci praepositus no[str]ae qui de super instat.
Inde tibi si forte libe[t pe]rcurrere cuncta,
Aspice, dicemus qu[anto se vert]ice moles
Intulit in nubem stellanti proxima caelo.[9]

The date of this inscription is about the time of Septimius Severus (Wilmanns).

III. Find Out

1. Quid.

Greg. Glor. Mart. 9 (p. 494, 17): Quod cum christiani, quid actum fuerat, didicissent, concurrunt omnes ad tam iniquum spectaculum.

Cor. Io. IV 626: Expertus totiens quid terror in armis
Et virtus Romana potest.

4. Quae, etc.

Greg. Hist. Fr. V 39 (p. 232, 8): Elecere ab eo cupiens . . . cuius consilium usus fuerat.[10]

Greg. Hist. Fr. VI 36 (p. 276, 13): Conperto autem post dies multos propinqui eius quae acta fuerant, ad ulciscendam humilitatem generis sui velocius properant.

9. Qualiter.

Greg. Hist. Fr. VIII 31 (p. 347, 20): Sed et aliquos adpraehendit, quibus supplicio subditos veritatem extorsit, qualiter per consilium Fredegundis haec acta fuerant.

[9] So Buecheler; Wilmanns reads *quam celso vertice*; the inscription, "ASPICEDICEMUSOU."

[10] *fuerit* A1.

Hist. Fr. X 2 (p. 410, 4): Dicens: "Arma deponite et ad nos egredimini, ut cognoscamus pacifice, qualiter homicidium factum est."

10. Quantus, etc.

Sil. Ital. IV 71: En age, qui sacros montis rupesque profundas
Transiluit, discat, *quanto stat* celsius arce
Herculea vallum, et maius sit scandere collis,
An vestros rupisse globos.[11]

19. Quam.

Sen. Nat. Quaest. III Praef. 9: Regna ex infimo coorta supra imperantes constiterunt, vetera imperia in ipso flore cecideruntur; inveniri non potest numerus, *quam* multa ab aliis fracta *sunt*.[12]

Greg. Virt. S. Mart. II 16 (p. 614, 21): Ergo noveritis, quam velociter in id quod invocatus fuerit, si petatur fideliter, apparebit.

Enno. 280, 23: Nam dum agnoscitis quam variis morborum fatigor incommodis, pro peccatis meis febribus frequenter addicor.

23. Ut.

Ter. Andr. Alter Exitus Suppositicius 14: Mihi non minus est gaudio
Me repperisse, ut habitus antehac fui tibi,
Quam mi evenire nunc id quod abs te expeto.

28. Si.

Greg. Hist. Fr. IX 38 (p. 392, 21): Ad quos rex ipse procedens, ait: "Egrediemini in iudicio, ut cognoscamus de his quae vobis obiciuntur, si vera sunt an falsa. . . . ."[13]

[11] *stet* Heinsius.

[12] *sunt* BϵEOρ: *sint* AΘλZ.

[13] *sit* A^1: *sint* D5.

Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 28 (p. 842, 39): 'Non gustabo, donec cognoscam, si miserebitur Deus huic homini, et si sit reputandus inter salvatos.'

IIID. Determine, Judge

1. Quid.

Aelius Lampridius, Hist. Aug. XVI 7, 5: Quid boni adepti sumus, mi uxor, caret aestimatione.

10. Quantus, etc.

Sen. Dial. I 5, 7: Fata nos ducunt et quantum cuique temporis restat, prima nascentium hora disposuit.[14]

19. Quam.

Gellius 19, 8, 6: Propterea peto ut, si Gai Caesaris liber prae manibus est, promi iubeas, ut quam confidenter hoc indicat aestimari a te possit.[15]

23. Ut.

Ter. Andr. Alter Exitus Suppositicius 16: Animum, Charine, quocumque adplicaveris,
Studium exinde ut erit, tute existimaveris.

IIIE. Consider, Reflect

4. Quae, etc.

Greg. Glor. Confes. 77 (p. 794, 13): Venit in memoriam, quae Felicem Namneticum referentem, dum de his confabularemur, audivi.

10. Quantus, etc.

Greg. Hist. Fr. II Prologus (p. 58, 25): Meminiat etiam sub Heliae eximii vatis tempore, . . . *quantae* populorum strages *fuere*,

[14] *restat* (ante *r* et post *t* ras.).

[15] *dicat* some codd.

quae famis vel quae siccitas miseram oppraesserit humum; quae sub Ezechie tempore . . . Hierusolima mala pertulerit.[16]

19. Quam.

Vegetius IV 1, 13: Nullus autem uberiores ciborum repudiabit expensas qui considerare voluerit, boum per inopiam pereuntium quam cariora sunt pretia.[17]

Enno. 309, 2: Recolat quam imperiosa est semper affectio.

IV. Know

1. Quid.

Com. A. 787: Et gaudet in Deo reminiscens quid fuit ante.

Amm. Mar. XVIII 3, 5: Supervixit, penitus quid erat gestum ignorans.

Jer. C. Pelag. II 14: Petrus apostolus tria vult facere in monte tabernacula . . . nesciens quid loquitur timore perterritus.

C. Pelag. III 8: Intellige quid loquitur: Nec in sapientia nostra, nec in ullis virtutibus confidendum.

Aug. Serm. V 7: Norunt fideles quid accipiunt.

Aug. Serm. LVI 13: Nam ille scit quid est facturus.

Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 1 (p. 828, 16): "Et ne statuas illis hoc in peccatum, quia nesciunt quid faciunt." . . . Dicebant: "Peccavimus in te, nescientes quid faceremus."[18]

Enno. 229, 3: Agnovistis quid fecerunt silentia vestra.

Enno. 283, 20: Unde contigit me nescire quid actum fuerat.

2. Quis.

Greg. Vit. Patr. VIII (5) (p. 696, 7): Cui ait quidam: "O diacone, si scires virtutem Dei, et quis fuit, cuius vestimentum uteris, cautius te cum eo vivere oportebat."[19]

[16] *fuere* lacking in C1.

[17] *sint* Schneider, with n. cr.: "vulgo *sunt*."

[18] *faceremus*] *fecerimus* 3, 5: *facere debeamus* 4.

[19] *fuerit* 3.

4. Quae, etc.

Asconius In Cornelianam 69 (p. 78, 5): " Quae est illa lex Cassia qua suffragiorum potestas convaluit manifestum est.[20]

8. Qualis, etc.

Sen. Nat. Quaest. VII 25, 1: Si quis hoc loco me interrogaverit 'quare ergo non, quemadmodum quinque stellarum, ita harum observatus est cursus?' huic ego respondebo: multa sunt, quae esse concedimus, *qualia sunt* ignoramus.[21]

Buecheler 596, 5 (CIL X 5958): Hae[c e]go cum dicto lacrimis fletuque dolens,
Pluria si potuisse in hoc titulo proscribere laudes
Ut scirent plures, qualis illa fuit.

Iulius Capitolinus, Hist. Aug. VIII 5, 2: Falco consul dixit: '*Qualis* imperator *es futurus*, hinc intellegimus, quod Laetum et Marciam, ministros scelerum Commodi, post te videmus.[22]

9. Qualiter.

Greg. Glor. Conf. 38 (p. 771, 25): Mysticum, ut opinor, hic ignis contenit sacramentum, et tenebrae sensus mei eum intellegere non queunt, *qualiter* apparens lumen tantum *praebet* nec quemquam *aduret*.[23]

10. Quantus, etc.

Lucilius Aetna 231: Scire quot et quae sint magno natalia mundo
Principia (occasus metuunt, ad saecula pergunt
Et firma aeterno religata est machina vinclo),

[20] *est* codd.: *sit* Manutius, Clark.
[21] *sunt* codd.: *sint* Muret., edd.
[22] *imperator effusus est* (or *et*) *hinc* B.
[23] *praebeat* 4. *aduerit* ras. e 1 b: *adurat* 4.

Solis scire modum et *quanto* minor orbita lunae *est:*

. . . . . .

239 Tempora cur varient anni (ver, prima iuventa,
Cur aestate perit, cur aestas ipsa senescit
Autumnoque obrepit hiems et in orbe recurrit)

. . . . . .

251 . . . divina est animi ac iucunda voluptas.[24]

The *quanto*-clause is certainly an indirect question, and the *cur*-clauses following are in all probability instances of this construction.

Buecheler 565, 5 (CIL XII 825): O utinam possit reparari spiritus ille,
Ut sciret quantus dolor est.

This inscription is in letters of the third century (Hirschfeld), and comes from Gallia Narbonensis.

Trebellius Pollio, Hist. Aug. XXII 5, 3: Et ut scias, quanta vis in Valeriano meritorum fuit publicorum, ponam senatus consulta.[25]

19. Quam.

Val. Max. 5, 7 ext. 1: Iam patebit quam multa quamque difficilia paterni adfectus indulgentia superavit.[26]

20. Ubi.

Paulus Ed. 23, 2, 10 (Kalb, Roms Juristen, p. 123; Juristenlatein, p. 77): Si fuerit ignotus ubi degit.

28. Si.

Tert. Apol. 29 (beginning): Constet igitur prius si isti . . . salutem . . . impertire possunt.

[24] 239 *varient* C S: *variant* r v Esc. (according to Ellis).

[25] *fuit* B P M: *fuerit* other codd., Peter.

[26] *superavit* codd.: *superaverit* edd.

Tert. Bapt. 15 (beginning): Nescio si quid amplius ad controversiam baptismi ventilatur.

Aug. Serm. XLV, 6 (from Regnier, p. 69): Nescio si versatur ante oculos vestros nisi Christus.

V. Hear

1. Quid.[27]

Aug. Serm. XXXVII 10: Audi quid sequitur.

2. Quis.[27]

Aug. Serm. XXIV 4: Audi quis vocat.

9. Qualiter.

Com. Instr. II 19, 2: Audi vocem, quae vis Christiana manere Beatus Paulus qualiter te ornari praecepit.

Com. A. 736: De quo iam audistis qualiter prophetae canebant.

28. Si.

Sulp. Sev. Dial. I 2, 2: Libenter ex te audiemus si vel in eremo vivere Christianis licet.

VI. See

2. Quis.[27]

Aug. Serm. XXIV 4: Ecce quis vocat.

8. Qualis etc.

Com. Instr. I 17, 6: Vidistis saepe dites moechos, quali fragore luxurias ineunt.

[27] For the examples with *quid* and *quis*, cf. App. p. 200.

9. Qualiter.

Greg. Hist. Fr. IV 11 (p. 148, 2): Ait: "Videtis nunc, fratres dilectissimi, qualiter me haec multitudo pauperum diligit."[28]

Similar examples occur in Hist. Fr. II 3 (p. 65, 1); VII 15 (p. 300, 3) VIII 36 (p. 351, 11); Virt. S. Mart. II 55 (p. 628, 3).

10. Quantus, etc.

Sen. Nat. Quaest. II 22, 3: Quid ergo mirum, si tanta vis ignem excutit vel aliunde vel sibi? Vides enim, quantum fervorem sensura sunt corpora horum transitu trita.[29]

Nat. Quest. II 29: Vides enim quanto vocaliora sunt vacua quam plena, quanto intenta quam remissa.[30]

Nat. Quaest. III 10, 2: "At magna flumina sunt." Cum videris quanta sunt, rursus ex quanto prodeant aspice.[31]

Dial I 2, 5: Non vides quanto aliter patres, aliter matres indulgent?[32]

11. Quot.

Aug. Serm. LVII 13: Videtis . . . quot petitiones docuit nos Dominus Christus.

18. Quando.

Aug. Serm. II 7: Vide ergo quando factum est, et quando fit commemoratio facti ipsius.

21. Unde.

Aug. Serm. XLVI 9: Videte unde coepit.

28. Si.

Aug. Serm. XLV, 6: Videte si potest dici nisi de Christo.

[28] *dirigit* C1, corr.

[29] *sunt* codd.: *sint* Gron., edd.

[30] *sint* P Z, edd.

[31] *sint* pZ, edd.

[32] Thus Baehrens, *Beiträge* 521: *indulgeant* Vahlen, with n.: "*indulgent*^{a} (*a* m. pr.)."

VII. Concern

26-27. Utrum-an.

Sen. Nat. Quaest. III 20, 2: Hae causae saporem dant aquis varium. . . . Interest, utrum loca sulphure *an* nitro an bitumine plena *transierunt*; hac ratione corruptae cum vitae periculo bibuntur.[33]

VIIB. Care

1. Quid.

Petron. 44, 2: "Narratis quod nec ad caelum nec ad terram pertinet, cum interim nemo curat quid annona mordet."[34]

XI. Reproach

13. Cur.

Verus to Fronto (p. 116, 12): Fratrem meum obiurgavi cur me non revocavit.[35]

This is the only example that I have found of the indicative mood in a *cur*-clause after a verb of accusing or the like. For the subjunctive in such clauses, compare Fronto, p. 18 Naber; Hor. Ep. I 8, 10; Carm. I 33, 3; Cic. Att. III 12, 1 and III 13, 2; Verr. Act. II 3, 7, 16; Pro Sest. 37, 80; De Fin. 5, 27, 80; Tac., Ann. 6, 4, and 15, 60; Pliny, Ep. 3, 5, 16; Jerome, Ep. 27, 1; Greg., H. F. X. 19 (p. 431, 18); Virt. S. Mart II 32; Virgilius Maro, Epitomae VII (near the beginning). Hale, *Cum-Constructions*, p. 106 (German translation, p. 119) cites most of these subjunctive examples, and explains this use of *cur* as follows: "[Cur] challenges the person addressed to give a reason why he does . . . so and so, and, while remaining an interrogative . . . yet becomes in effect a sign of reproach.

[33] *transierunt* Φ: *-ierint* δE Gercke: *-eant* ε.

[34] See Buecheler for emendations.

[35] *revocarit* Heindorf.

CHAPTER VII

Preliminary Conclusion

Just as in the Latin of the republican and the Augustan ages, so in the Latin of later times, there are found a large number of indicative clauses which are most naturally understood as indirect questions, and a smaller, but still considerable, number which, if the sole or best manuscript tradition is followed, are indubitable instances of this construction. To emend the instances of the latter kind would be as unjustifiable as to emend the similar instances in the earlier period. Cf. Part I, pp. 106 ff.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

I. The Occurrence of Instances of the Indicative Indirect Question

There are found, in the Latin of all periods and all styles, a rather large number of indicative clauses which are most naturally interpreted as indirect questions and a smaller number which, if the sole or best manuscript tradition is followed, must indubitably be so interpreted.[1] These indicative clauses have, the first group probably, and the second group certainly, exactly the same force as *subjunctive* indirect questions of fact.[2]

II. Unjustifiability of Emendation and Forced Interpretation

Scholars often resort to forced interpretation or to emendation of such examples. It seems to me that they are wrong in doing so.

[1] See, for the first group, pp. 12 ff., 33 ff., 56 ff., 80 ff., 86 ff., 111 ff., 127 ff.; for the second group pp. 96 ff. and 144 ff.

[2] With very few exceptions our indicative indirect questions are indirect questions of *fact*. However, I accept as genuine also the few apparent examples of the indicative indirect question of deliberation. For the examples, cf. p. 12, n. 11.

In order to explain away the instances of the indicative indirect question in Latin, one would need to make use of forced interpretations and emendations to an extent which seems to me unjustifiable. Besides, there are some instances which it is impossible to explain away: indicative clauses which it is impossible either to interpret otherwise than as indirect questions or to emend without violence. Here is a wall that cannot be passed. Cf. pp. 106 ff.

That the indicative clauses which *must* be interpreted as indirect questions are less numerous than those which are most naturally, but not of necessity, so interpreted, is not surprising to one who considers how many points of contact the indirect question has with other constructions. Sometimes indirect questions are indistinguishable from direct questions; sometimes from relative clauses; at other times from conditions. There is no particle or pronoun that introduces an indirect question, which may not also introduce one or more of these constructions.

It should be borne in mind, too, that among the passages which I have classed as "naturally interpreted as indirect questions," there are many which are practically certain instances: instances which can only by considerable forcing be interpreted otherwise than as indirect questions. Cf., e.g., Prop. III 5, 27 ff. (p. 17); Ovid, Rem. Am. 683, Sed quid praecipue nostris conatibus obstat, Eloquar exemplo quemque docente suo (p. 14); Plaut.Pseud. 599, Nimis velim certum qui id mihi faciat, Ballio leno ubi hic habitat (p. 15); Bacch. 202 (p. 35); Most. 149 (p. 35); Catull. 69, 10, Quare aut crudelem nasorum interfice pestem, Aut admirari desine cur fugiunt (p. 28); Cic. Fam. XVI 27, 2 (p. 43); Ter. Phorm. 247 (p. 43); Cic. Att. IV 5, 1 (p. 43). Indeed, in my anxiety to class as certain instances of the indicative indirect question only those examples for which there are objective proofs, I have sometimes classed as probable instances, clauses which others regard as certain instances. Cf. Plaut. M.G. 1075 (cited p. 34), where Becker suggests a change of reading, from indicative to subjunctive; and Sen. Agam. 414 (p. 111). My method of arranging the examples in this study perhaps makes the case for the indicative indirect question appear weaker than it really is.

Since there occur some absolutely certain instances of the indicative indirect question of fact, and a large number of instances which can only by forcing be interpreted otherwise than as examples of this

construction, it seems to me that one should interpret an indicative clause as an indirect question, whenever this interpretation is the most natural one. To be sure, scholars may sometimes be unable to reach a decision, or may disagree, as to what the most natural interpretation is, and accordingly many passages must be left as indeterminate.[3] However, before considering, in a given instance, what the most natural interpretation is, one should free oneself from all prejudice against the indicative indirect question. There is no reason whatever, apart from tradition, for objecting to this construction.[4]

III. Comparative Frequency of the Construction in Conversational and Inelegant Styles

While indicative indirect questions occur in all sorts of writings, yet they are more usual in conversational than in literary, and in inelegant than in elegant styles.[5] In Cicero's prose works, the certain or probable instances of the indicative indirect question are distributed as follows:[6] letters twenty-seven instances, philosophical

[3] Cf. the examples cited on pp. 6 ff., 29 ff., 45 ff., 78 ff., 110 ff., and 125.

[4] Cf. pp. 106 ff.

[5] Cf., on colloquial and inelegant prose, Wölfflin, "Bemerkungen über das Vulgärlatein," *Philologus* XXXIV (1876) 137-165 (especially 137-8); Rebling, *Versuch einer Charakteristik der römischen Umgangssprache* (Kiel, 1873); Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata* (Marburg, 1875) 12 ff. It is, to be sure, impossible to classify all Latin writings as colloquial or not colloquial, or as elegant or inelegant. Both conversation and writing show many grades of elegance, and the various grades are not distinguished by sharply defined boundaries. Cf. Rebling 5 ff.; Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Upsala, 1911), pp. 8 ff. History is generally written in formal, not in colloquial, style. Yet, as Wölfflin remarks, *op. cit.*, 147, it is not surprising to find "einzelne vulgäre Ausdrücke" in Livy and Tacitus.

[6] The passages are the following ones. By the "certain" examples are meant the examples which must be indirect questions; by the "probable" ones, those which are most naturally interpreted as indirect questions. Those of the "certain" examples which show no manuscript variation that is relevant to our problem are starred. In the other "certain" examples there is more or less manuscript variation. The numbers in parentheses refer to the pages of this study on which the examples are cited.

"Certain" examples: Att. I 19, 4(102); III 7, 3(103); VII 12, 1(97)*; VII 26, 3(97)*; X 12, 4(102)*; XI 19, 1(97)*; Fam. VI 9, 2(104)*; VII 4(104)*; XIV 5, 1(103)*; Off. II 7, 23(98); Acad. Pr. II 15, 46(100); Verr. Act. II, I 8, 22(100); Cat. II 3, 5(102); Har. Resp. 17, 37(97).

works twelve, rhetorical works four, orations eleven.[7] In the letters twenty of the twenty-seven examples are from *Ad Atticum*, which is more colloquial than *Ad Familiares* (cf. Wölfflin, p. 139). Caesar, who exhibits a greater aversion to colloquialisms than does Cicero,[8] has no certain example of the indicative indirect question.[9] There are apparently no examples in Tacitus or Pliny the Younger, and only two probable ones in Quintilian.[10] On the other hand, there are occasional certain or probable examples of the construction in various authors whose styles show colloquial features.[11]

Probable examples: Att. II 10(15); III 23, 4(85); IV 5, 1(43); V 20, 7(24); VII 12, 2(20); VIII 2, 2(15); VIII 11, 5(26); VIII 13, 2(37); IX 13, 3(68); X 12 A 2(38); XII 40, 3(56); XIII 18, 1(36); XIII 30, 3(65); XIV 13, 2(20); Fam. II 9, 1(68); VIII 1, 2(59); XIV 17(71); XVI 27, 2(43); Deor. Nat. II 6, 18(57); De Leg. I 9, 27(61); Fin. IV 24, 67(66) and V 9, 24(69); Tusc. I 13, 29(26) and V 41, 121(62); Rep. I 19, 31(12); Lael. 15, 55(68) and 25, 96(34); C. M. 6, 18(59); Rosc. Am. 34, 95(71); Verr. Act. II, I 28, 72(22); II 53, 131(65); III 26, 64(70); Flac. 32, 80(12); In Toga Candida (18); Leg. Agr. II 4, 15(61) and II 18, 49(59); Inv. I 28, 43(27) and II 12, 39(72); De Orat. II 42, 180(38) and II 60, 243(109).

[7] The difference cannot be adequately explained on the ground that Cicero used indirect questions more often in his letters than elsewhere. In the Catilinarian orations alone there are some twenty-nine instances of the subjunctive indirect question of fact.

[8] Cf. J. Lebreton, *Caesariana Syntaxis* (Paris, 1901) 110.

[9] B.G. I 20, 6 (cited p. 58) *may* be a relative clause. Neither is the *si*-clause in Cic. Att. IX 7 C, I (cited p. 78) a certain example of an indirect question.

[10] Pliny and Quintilian are almost entirely free from colloquialisms. Cf. Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 144 and 147 ff. For Tacitus, cf. p. 160, n. 5. Quintilian has two probable instances of the indicative indirect question: Inst. IV 5, 1 (cited p. 132) and IV 5, 26 (cited p. 128). Inst. XII 8, 6 is in all probability a relative clause: Hi porro non tantum nocerent, si omnia scriberent uti gesta sunt. As regards the one possible instance of an indicative indirect question in Pliny—Ep. VII 20, 6—I agree with the editors who punctuate it otherwise than as an indirect question: Sed nos, nihil interest mea quo loco, iungimur.

Other authors who seem not to have used the indicative mood in indirect questions are Phaedrus, Suetonius, and Velleius Paterculus. For Phaedrus see C. Causeret, *De Phaedri Sermone Grammaticae Observationes* (Paris, 1886) 76. O. Lange, *Zum Sprachgebrauch des Velleius Paterculus* (Stettin, 1886) 18, in his discussion of indirect questions says nothing about mood. There is apparently no mention of indicative indirect questions in P. Bogge, *De Elocutione C. Suetoni Tranquilli* (Upsala, 1875).

[11] Varro shows four certain examples (pp. 97, 102, and 104), eight probable examples (pp. 26, 27, 57, 58, 72, 73, 74) and two possible examples (pp. 6 and 48); Sallust three probable (pp. 38, 59, 64) and one possible (p. 48) instances;

One should remember, to be sure, that the construction may have been used in formal styles more freely than our manuscripts would lead us to believe. The "emendation" of indicative indirect questions has, we know, been going on ever since the time of Lambinus.[12] It may be, also, that at a much earlier period copyists sometimes deliberately substituted the subjunctive mood for the indicative in indirect questions. At the time of the grammarian Diomede, the use of the subjunctive in this construction was considered more scholarly than the use of the indicative.[13] It is quite possible, then, that critics even at this early day should sometimes have deliberately "emended" indicative indirect questions which did occur in writings of careful style. It is also, of course, possible that copyists should sometimes have unconsciously substituted the subjunctive for the indicative, the more common construction for that which was comparatively infrequent (cf. p. 169). However, in spite of these possibilities, the fact that the large majority of the examples from classical Latin are found in works or passages of colloquial or of inartistic character, is hardly to be explained otherwise than on the supposition that the indicative indirect question was considerably more usual in the colloquial and the inartistic, than in the formal and the artistic styles of Latin.

It may be significant, that in poetry too—where emendation would often be impossible; cf. p. 106—the examples of the indicative indirect question generally occur in works or passages that are more or less colloquial. Thus, there is a probable example in Horace's

---

Vitruvius one certain example (p. 100) and five probable ones (pp. 26 and 60). For colloquial elements in these authors, cf. Wölfflin, 146 ff. Sallust, according to Wöfflin, l.c., uses *vulgäres Demokratenlatein* chiefly in the Catiline, to some extent in the Jugurtha, least in the Histories. All the instances which I have found are in the first two works.

As examples from other periods, of authors who wrote in colloquial language and who used the indicative mood in indirect questions, may be cited Plautus and Gregory (see Index Locorum).

[12] Cf. Stolz-Schmalz 516 and the critical notes on the examples cited in this study.

[13] Cf. the remark of Diomede: "Eruditius dicetur 'nescio quid facias' pro 'nescio quid facis' " (389 Putsch; 395, 15 Keil).

Epistles,[14] and one in the Satires, but none in the Odes.[15] There are probable instances in Catullus, Martial, Juvenal, and Persius, and certain instances in Propertius.[16] In the elevated epic style, the construction is not frequent. Lucretius has six probable examples of the indicative indirect question, over against some one hundred thirty-eight instances of the subjunctive indirect question of fact.[17] Virgil has six probable examples in the Aeneid,[18] while he has five in the much shorter Eclogues and Georgics.[19] Moreover, the examples in the Aeneid are all in direct quotation. When the poet speaks in his own person in his epic poem he uses the subjunctive.[20] Lucan has five probable examples of the indicative indirect question.[19]

There seems to be a significant contrast between Lucretius' De Rerum Natura and the more colloquial poetry of his contemporary Catullus, with regard to the proportions of indicative and subjunctive indirect questions of fact. The approximate statistics for Lucretius have just been given. Catullus has five probable examples of the indicative construction[19] and twenty-one, at most, of the subjunctive. To be sure, none of the indicative examples in these two poets are

[14] The indicative passages referred to in this paragraph are Horace Ep. I 7, 39 (p. 84); Serm. II 4, 38(68); Catullus 61, 78(40); 61, 99(41); 62, 8(40); 62, 12 (41); 69, 10(28); Martial III 32, 1(117); III 95, 3(112); VI 88(117); IX 92, 1(135); Juvenal V 67(121); Persius III 67(112); Propertius II 34, 53(96); II 30, 29 and II 34, 36(99); III 5, 40(100); Lucretius I 269(71); II 814(73); IV 290(28); IV 1204 (38); V 274(62); VI 811(42); Virgil Ecl. IV 52(41); V 7(41); Georg. I 57(40); II 122(59); IV 150(59); Aen. VI 615(60); VI 779(41); VI 856(42); VII 207(64); VIII 192(42); IX 269(72); Lucan I 126(114); II 682(113); VIII 170(117); VIII 645 (136); IX 563(116).

[15] For the difference in style between the Odes, on the one hand, and the Satires and Epistles, on the other, cf. Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 145-6.

[16] For the occurrence of colloquial elements in these authors, cf. Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 137; V. Gérard, "Le latin vulgaire et le langage familier dans les satires de Perse, *Musée belge* I (1897) 87, n. 7; M. Rothstein, ed. Propertius (Berlin, 1898), p. XLV.

[17] Meyer-Lübke, "Die vorromanischen Volkssprachen," in Gröber, *Grundriss* (Strassburg, 1888) I, p. 378, thinks that Lucretius' language approaches, in some measure, the "Umgangssprache." To me Lucretius' language seems very far removed from the speech of every day.

[18] There are possible examples also in Aen. I 322 (p. 78) and II 739 (p. 78).

[19] Cf. n. 14, above.

[20] I have counted 22 examples of the subjunctive indirect question of fact in the first five books of the Aeneid, 4 in the Eclogues, and 12 in the Georgics.

absolutely certain instances of the indirect question. Yet some of the examples could only by extremely forced interpretations be otherwise explained. Cf. Catullus 69, 10, Aut admirari desine cur fugiunt (p. 28).

To be sure, not every inelegant writer used the indicative indirect question.[21] A man would not need to be a nice stylist, in order to avoid the use of this construction, if he chose to do so. Sometimes indeed a poorly educated writer might take especial pains to use the subjunctive mood. Kroll[22] (not, to be sure, referring to indirect questions) remarks that the author of the Bellum Africum "durch gelegentliche Anwendung des Konjunktivs wohl seine Bildung an den Tag legen wollte (schon von Nipperdey, Ausg. 21, 25 beobachtet)."

IV. Outline of the History of the Construction

Whether or not the indicative indirect question is a colloquialism, depends on how this term is defined. The general facts of the use of the construction are, as it seems to me, reasonably certain. The indicative was the original mood of the indirect question of fact.[23] The subjunctive came somehow to be used besides the indicative in this construction,[24] and it encroached by degrees upon the indicative.[25] The use of the subjunctive spread farther in the written than in the spoken language, and in formal than in informal or formless

[21] I have found no example in the Bellum Africum, which I have read through in the course of my search. There seems to be no example in Nepos (At least I have nowhere found any reference to the occurrence of the indicative indirect question in his writings. I have read only the lives of Miltiades, Themistocles, Aristides, and Hannibal). While Nepos was better educated than the author of the Bellum Africum, yet, according to Wölfflin, p. 146, he falls far short of urbanity.

[22] "Randbemerkungen," *Rheinisches Museum* LXIX (1914) 108.

[23] Cf. p. xxviii, n. 27.

[24] The subjunctive mood occurs in an indirect question of fact in old Umbrian. Cf. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, 217 and for "Old Umbrian" 7 (The indicative occurs also; cf. Buck 217). This fact does not prove that this use of the subjunctive arose in pre-Latin times. It may have done so, or it may have developed independently in Latin and Umbrian.

[25] The encroachment of the subjunctive upon the indicative in the indirect question is paralleled by that in the descriptive clause of fact. Cf. Hale-Buck, §521, 1b.

styles.[26] However, the indicative never wholly ceased to be used even in writings of formal style.[27] For the use of the moods in late Latin, see App. I.

V. Comparative Frequency of the Construction in Early and in Late Latin

Indicative indirect questions occur more frequently, in comparison with subjunctive indirect questions of fact, in early and in late Latin writings than in the writings of the Ciceronian and early imperial ages.[28] It is, to be sure, conceivable that writers of the Ciceronian and immediately succeeding periods used the indicative indirect question more freely than our manuscripts would lead us to believe. Instances may have been "emended" by early scholars (cf. pp. 162 ff.). Still, it is reasonably certain that the authors who lived in the Ciceronian and early imperial ages used the indicative indirect question less freely than either early or late Latin writers used it. This difference seems to be largely due to the fact that choiceness of language was most commonly striven after, or at least most commonly attained, by the writers of the Ciceronian age and

[26] That the indicative indirect question continued to be used to a considerable extent in the informal conversation even of highly educated persons is shown by its use in Cicero's letters. Cf. pp. 160-1, n. 6. We need not concern ourselves in this study with the problem of the existence of many kinds of conversational Latin and of innumerable degrees of elegance and inelegance of language. Cf. p. 160, n. 5.

[27] Rebling is not altogether right when he remarks, *op. cit.*, 7: "Das Einschleichen vulgärer Constructionen in den strengen Stil zeigt am klarsten der Indikativ in abhängigen Fragesätzen." It is not correct to speak of *Einschleichen* if, as is reasonably certain, the indicative was never wholly dislodged from the formal style of writing. However, Rebling's general idea seems to be correct: namely, that the indicative indirect question is on the whole—at least in the Ciceronian age—confined to colloquial styles, but is found occasionally in formal styles.

[28] This statement is based, in part, upon my general impression. I have not made any very detailed study of the ratios of indicative to subjunctive indirect questions of fact in the Latin of the various periods. See, however, for Plautus, p. 169, n. 46; for Lucretius and Catullus, p. 163; for Virgil, p. 163, esp. n. 20. See also, for indicative indirect questions in the Ciceronian and early imperial periods, pp. 160 ff., notes 6, 11, and 14. For late Latin see Appendix I.

The frequency of the indicative indirect question in late Latin has been remarked, for example, by Sittl, *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache* (Erlangen, 1882) 134 and by Appel, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Corippus*, 55, n. 1.

that which immediately followed it.[29] The frequency of the indicative construction in early Latin writings may be partially accounted for by the theory that in the language of the early period this construction still maintained itself, against the encroachment of the subjunctive mood, to a greater extent than in the language of the Ciceronian and Augustan ages. How far the greater relative frequency of the indicative indirect question in Plautus, as compared with Terence, is to be accounted for by this theory, and how far by the fact that Plautus' style is less elegant than that of Terence, I see no way of deciding.[30]

VI. The Construction Seldom Used as an Archaism

Since the indicative indirect question occurs in the Latin of all periods and all styles, the explanation sometimes given of the construction, that it is an archaism,[31] is in general unnecessary. This explanation has little in its favor, except for a very limited range of Latin writings.[32] It is significant that Lucretius, who frequently archaizes,[33] apparently uses the indicative indirect question far less often, in comparison with the subjunctive construction, than his

[29] In the Ciceronian age the gap between the literary language and the language of ordinary conversation seems to have been greater than in the preceding or in the succeeding period. Rebling says, *op. cit.*, 9: "Die bei Beginn der Litteratur noch unmerkliche Kluft erweiterte sich schon zur Zeit des Naevius, Plautus und Ennius, ein weitererer Schritt zur Differenzierung geschah durch Scipio und seinen Kreis, sie prägt sich endlich am schärfsten aus zur Zeit Caesars und Ciceros, bis der allmähliche Verfall der Classicität beide Sprachrichtungen immer näher zusammenführte."

[30] Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 145, mentions the difficulty of distinguishing between archaisms and vulgarisms in Plautus and Terence.

[31] The explanation of the use of the indicative in an indirect question as an archaism is given, e.g., by Korn-Ehwald on Ovid Met. X 637. Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 146 ff., protests against the explanation of every linguistic peculiarity in Sallust, as an archaism: often, he says, it would be better "von vulgärem Demokratenlatein zu sprechen."

[32] Kalb, *Das Juristenlatein* (Nuremberg, 1888) p. 7, calls attention to the conservative character of the language of law. The probable instance of the construction in Cic. Rep. (p. 12) may be an archaism. For Cicero's use of archaisms in this work cf. Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 141.

[33] For Lucretius' tendency to archaize, cf., e.g., M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, 3d ed. (Munich, 1909) I, II, 49. But see also this paper, p. 163, n. 17.

contemporary Catullus, a writer of colloquial style, who seldom employs archaisms. Cf. p. 163, n. 14.[34-35]

VII. The Construction Not a Grecism

The use in Latin of the indicative mood in indirect questions is never a Grecism, in the strict sense of the term. The indicative indirect question is a legitimate Latin construction. For the theory of Greek *influence*, however, something may be said.[36] Latin authors may sometimes, when they had Greek models before them, have been influenced by the mood use in Greek, to employ the indicative, in preference to the subjunctive, in indirect questions. Certain Christian writers particularly may have been influenced by the mood use in Greek.[37] However, their frequent employment of the indicative mood in indirect questions may generally be adequately explained by the colloquial character of their writings.[38] Upon certain late compilers of laws, Greek usage—as well as the archaizing tendency of legal Latin—may have had an influence.[39] In general, it seems to

[34] For the colloquial character of Catullus' poetry, cf. Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 137.

[35] Gaffiot, "(Quis) Quid Relatif, "*Rev. de phil.*, XXXIV (1910) opposes the theory that the indicative indirect question is an archaism, by arguing that the construction does not occur in Sallust, "cet écrivain qui reproduit, dit-on, comme à plaisir les tours de la syntaxe archaïque. (But for Sallust's archaisms, cf. p. 166, n. 31.) There are, however, three probable instances in Sallust (cf. pp. 38, 59, 64), beside one example which may well be interpreted either as an indirect question or as a relative clause (cf. p. 48). To the last mentioned example should be added Jug. 4, 4, if the manuscript reading is correct. However, it seems to me that Elberling's conjecture is probably right. See Dietsch *ad. loc.*

[36] For the theory that Greek influence is responsible for indicative indirect questions, see Kühnast, *Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax* 234; Norden on Aeneid VI 615 (quoted p. xxviii, n. 25). Lucian Mueller comments on Horace, Serm. II 4, 38, that the indicative is used "in Nachahmung der älteren Römer so wie der Griechen (ed. 1891)." A somewhat similar comment occurs in the edition of Heindorf (1815). Cf. p. 69.

[37] Cf. Riemann-Goelzer, *op. cit.*, 419, n. 1.

[38] Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 137, remarks that many church fathers speak to the people in the language of the people. For various opinions about the language of the Itala (whether it is colloquial or full of Grecisms) see J. McIntosh, *A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis* (Chicago, 1912) 7 ff. Cf. also Rönsch, *op. cit.*, 1 ff.

[39] Kalb, *Das Juristenlatein* 66 ff., thinks that it had. For the archaizing tendency of legal Latin, cf. *op. cit.*, 7.

me, the theory of Greek influence has been too extensively employed in accounting for the use of the indicative indirect question in Latin.

VIII. The Influence of Meter

Metrical convenience may sometimes have determined the mood usage in indirect questions.[40] However, the use of the indicative indirect question in poetry was not a "metrischer Notbehelf."[41] It was, rather, perfectly legitimate to use either the indicative or the subjunctive in the indirect question, alike in poetry and in prose. A poet, like a prose writer, was free to choose between the two moods. Instances of the indicative are occasionally found in formal prose works of all periods, and they occur in poetry where the meter would admit of the subjunctive.[42]

Indeed there does not seem to be very much difference between prose and verse in regard to the mood-use in indirect questions. In both prose and verse the indicative mood is comparatively frequent in colloquial styles, and is rare in formal styles.[43] Cf. pp. 160 ff., 166-7. The reason why some scholars have conceded the indicative construction for all sorts of poetry but not for formal prose, seems to be that, while emendation has practically cleared our formal prose texts of examples, the similar treatment of poetical works has been interfered with by metrical considerations.[44]

[40] Cf. Kroll, "Randbemerkungen," *Rheinisches Museum LXIX* (1914) 106, n. 1; Norden on Virgil Aen. VI 615; Palmer on Horace, Serm. II 4, 38.

[41] It is so regarded by Draeger, II 475.

[42] This has been observed, in the case of Propertius, by Uhlmann, De Sex. Properti Genere Dicendi 74.

[43] I have not made any detailed statistical study of the ratios of indicative to subjunctive indirect questions of fact in poetry and in prose. It may be that the ratio is somewhat higher in elegant poetry than in elegant prose. Lucretius has six probable instances of the indicative to some 138 of the subjunctive (cf. p. 166). Cicero has twenty-seven certain or probable instances of the indicative in his philosophical works, rhetorical works, and orations together (p. 160, n. 6) and has some twenty-nine instances of the subjunctive indirect question of fact in the Catilinarian orations alone. However, we have no means of knowing how many indicative examples in Cicero have been changed by scribes to the subjunctive.

[44] Cf. p. 106.

IX. Avoidance of Ambiguity, by the Use of the Indicative

In one instance, by using the indicative mood in an indirect question of fact, an author has made his meaning more clear.[45] Korn-Ehwald comments on Ovid Met. X 637, Quid facit ignorans (cited p. 102): "Die Konstruktion mit dem Indikativ hier einzusetzen hat Ovid gewagt, um zu vermeiden, dass ein indirektes *quid faciat* . . . als Vertreter eines direkten *quid faciam* aufgefasst würde.

X. The Subjunctive the More Usual Mood in the Indirect Question of Fact

It should be noted that, while the indicative mood occurs in indirect questions of fact in all periods and in all styles of Latin writings, yet the subjunctive is the more usual mood in this construction. Already in Plautus the subjunctive far outweighs the indicative in indirect questions of fact.[46] It remains the preponderant mood in the works which have come down to us from classical and later times.[47]

To be sure, in the writings of post-classical times, the indicative seems gradually to have gained upon the subjunctive. Yet, though occasionally, as in the Formulae Andegavenses, the indicative instances outnumber the subjunctive, in Latin writings as a whole it seems that the subjunctive examples outnumber the indicative examples in every period.[48] The following remark by Schmalz, p. 517, is incorrect: "Die spätlateinischen Schriftsteller weisen fast nur den Indikativ auf, z.B. Hist., Apoll., Ecl., Gramm., usw., oder nebeneinander Ind. u. Konj." The same is true, in lesser degree, of the statement in Kühner-Stegmann II, II §227, 8: "Vorwiegend ist der Indikativ im Spätlatein." Riemann-Goelzer, on the other hand,

[45] To be sure, the indicative is occasionally (but rarely) used in an indirect deliberative question. Cf. the comment on Plaut. Epid. 274, p. 12.

[46] In Men., Merc., M. G., Most., Pers., and Poen., there are five certain examples (cited pp. 97, 99, 101-102) and fifty-five probable examples (cited pp. 12-24; 33-42; 56-72, 81) of the indicative indirect question. In the same plays I have counted 143 certain or probable examples of the subjunctive indirect question of fact.

[47] See Appendix I, esp. p. 176.

[48] See Appendix I, pp. 180 ff.

correctly states, (*Grammaire Comparée* [Paris, 1897] §407 remarque I), that the subjunctive is on the whole more frequent than the indicative, "même dans des écrivains comme saint Jérôme et Grégoire de Tours."

For early Latin Sonnenschein gives a false impression when he says, *A New Latin Grammar* (Oxford, 1912) p. 172, n. 2: "The use of the subjunctive in dependent questions as to a matter of fact . . did not become a rule of Latin syntax till the time of Cicero, though it is often found in Old Latin." The implication seems to be that the indicative is the more usual mood in the indirect question of fact in early Latin, whereas the contrary is the case.[49] The facts are correctly stated by Kühner-Stegmann, II, II §227, 2: "In der vorklassischen Zeit überwiegt der Konjunktiv zwar auch schon, aber daneben hat sich der Indikativ noch in ziemlich bedeutendem Umfange gehalten."

XI. Limitations of the Use of the Indicative

Some limitations, actual or only alleged, of the use of the indicative in indirect questions are to be mentioned.

The use of the indicative mood was generally confined, in the republican and Augustan periods, to the indirect questions which follow primary tenses. The construction seems not to occur during these periods after the imperfect or the past perfect tense.[50] The clause in Plaut. Bacch. 983 (p. 51) may well be relative. There are two possible examples of the construction following a verb in the perfect tense: Sall. Cat. 23, 5 (p. 64) and Virg. Aen. IX 269 (p. 72). In the latter example *vidisti* is probably a present perfect, meaning "you have seen." Both examples *may* be interpreted as relative. I have classed them with the examples which are most naturally understood as indirect questions, but I should not quarrel with any one who thinks that, in view of the non-occurrence of certain examples of indirect questions with a similar combination of tenses, the clause in the Sallust passage should be interpreted as relative.

[49] Cf. p. 169, n. 46.

[50] Except in Ovid Her. XV 4, where we have a probable instance of an indicative indirect question depending on an imperfect subjunctive contrary-to-fact clause. The example is quoted on p. 70.

In later Latin we more often find the indicative indirect question after secondary tenses. Cf. Sen. Suas. I 10 (p. 129); Buech., Carm. Ep. 596, 5 (p. 153); Aug. Conf. V 14, 24 (p. 136); Greg. Glor. Mart. 9 (p. 149). Still, while I have made no statistical study of the matter, it seems to me reasonably certain that such a study would show that the ratio of indicatives to subjunctives in indirect questions of fact was even in late Latin very much lower after secondary than after primary tenses. An interesting example, as showing an indicative indirect question after a verb in the present tense, repeated, after a verb in a past tense, with change of mood, is Greg. Mirac. B. Andr. Apost. 1 (cited p. 152).

Gaffiot remarks, *Le prétendu emploi de si interrogatif en latin*, pp. 98-99: "Quand l'interrogation indirecte est due à une *particule*, si l'interrogation est *véritablement* indirecte, il n'y a pas *un cas dans la latinité* de construction indicative." It seems to be true that there is no absolutely certain example of an indicative indirect question introduced by any particle other than *si* (for *si*, cf. App., pp. 201 f.). However, there are a number of examples which it would be very forced to interpret otherwise than as indirect questions. Such an instance is Plaut. Aul. 65, Nunc ibo ut visam estne ita aurum ut condidi, Quod me sollicitat plurimis miserum modis.[51] It seems to me that these examples are to be interpreted as indirect questions, and that Gaffiot is mistaken in thinking that the indicative mood was not used in indirect questions which were introduced by particles.

XII. Parallel Use of Indicative and Subjunctive

Indicative indirect questions are sometimes found beside, and parallel to, subjunctive indirect questions of fact. Cf. Baehrens, *Beiträge* p. 525. Instances from practically all periods and kinds of writings are scattered throughout my lists of examples. That this phenomenon occurs in Plautus, is recognized by Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax*, p. 516; by Lorenz on Mostellaria 969; by Hallidie on Capt.

[51] Other examples are Bacch. 901 (23); Lucil. 375 (27); Ter. Andr. 878 (23); Prop. III 5, 27 ff. (17); Sen. Nat. Quaest. V 18, 12 (114); Apul. Met. VI 5 (114); Asconius In Cornelianam 54 (144); Tert. Virg. Vel. 9 (115); Greg. H. F. II 9 (114); Veg. IV 3, 9 (115); also, if the indicative is the correct reading, Cic. De Inv. I 28, 43 (27) and Flac. 32, 80 (12).

207; and by Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, p. 66. For its occurence in writers of the early empire see Uhlmann, *De Sex. Properti Genere Dicendi*, p. 74; Drakenborch on Livy XLI 24; Praun, *Die Syntax des Vitruvs*, p. 72. Schmalz wrongly remarks, *Lateinische Syntax*, p. 516, that perhaps the earliest occurrence in prose is in Asconius 68, 24. There is a certain example in Livy XLI 24, 5 (cited p. 102), and there are possible ones in Cic. Lael. 15, 55 (p 68), Quint. Inst. IV 5, 1 (p.132), and Sen. Dial. I 4, 4 (p.134).[52] In some writers the use of the subjunctive and the indicative mood in parallel clauses seems to be due to a conscious striving for variety. Cf. Praun's comment on Propertius III 5, 25 f., in *Syntax des Vitruvs*, p. 70; Bonnet, *La langue et le style de Grégoire de Tours*, p. 676; Schepss, *Die Sprache Priscillians*, p. 320. This is probably true of Apuleius[53] also, fond as he was of variety of expression. Poets may sometimes have been influenced in the matter by metrical convenience. Cf. Praun., *l.c.*

It should be noted that the indirect question is not the only Latin construction which admits of either the indicative or the subjunctive mood. Both moods are used in clauses attached to subjunctive clauses or to infinitives, and in closely attached descriptive relative clauses of fact.[54]

Likewise the use of the subjunctive and the indicative mood in parallel, adjoining clauses is not confined to the indirect question, though probably it is more common in this construction than in any

[52] For the phenomenon in later writers, see M. Leky, De Syntaxi Apuleiana (Ratebor, 1908) 45; A. Regnier, *De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1886) 70; F. Ferrerè, "Langue et Style de Victor de Vita", *Rev. de phil.*, XXV (1901) 326; H. Goelzer, *Le latin de Saint Avit* (Paris, 1909) 324; Appel, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Coripp*us 55; Bonnet, *Le syntaxe de Grégoire de Tours*, 676. In very late writings it seems to have been a common practice to change back and forth between the two moods, in successive clauses. Cf. the instance from Charlemagne, Epistula ad Odilbertum, referred to in App., p. 180.

[53] The instances in Apuleius of *variatio* in the indirect question, or of *variatio* of the indirect question and the relative clause are cited on pp. 125, 133, and 141.

[54] Cf. Baehrens, *l.c. supra*; Frank, *Attraction of Mood in Early Latin*, 58 ff.; Stroebel, *Tulliana* (Munich, 1908) 24 ff. For the descriptive relative clause of fact compare Hale-Buck, §521, I b, and examples cited there: Cic. Acad. 2, 2, 5, Sunt multi qui Graecas non ament litteras; Cic. Off. I 14, 43, Sunt multi qui eripiunt. . . .

other.[55] For the general subject of *variatio* in moods, see Baehrens, *Beiträge* pp. 516 ff.[56]

XIII. Application of the Results of this Paper to the Study of the Romance Languages

The chief concern of this paper has been with indirect questions of fact in the written Latin that has come down to us. Have the results obtained any bearing upon the vulgar spoken Latin from which the Romance languages developed? It seems to me that they have, even if the statement of Meyer-Lübke, *Die vorromanischen Volkssprachen*, p. 359, is conceded to be true: "Die Geschichte der lateinischen Volkssprache muss fast ganz aus den lebenden Sprachen konstruiert werden; das sprachliche Material, das was die alte Zeit liefert, lässt sich nur als Stütze einfügen." Conclusions drawn from written Latin may, then, be used to confirm evidence that is furnished by the modern, spoken languages.

What conclusions concerning the mood usage in indirect questions in vulgar, spoken Latin, are to be drawn from the study of written Latin? We can say that in the vulgar Latin of Cicero's time the mood usage was more like that found in his letters than like that of his orations. Similarly, of a later time, we can say that the Formulae Andegavenses were closer to vulgar Latin than were many other documents. But we cannot determine whether, or to what extent, the popular speech of each of these periods used the indicative in indirect questions of fact with greater relative frequency than Cicero in his letters or than the writers of the Formulae Andegavenses. So far as I know there are no documents, however colloquial, which, while containing any considerable number of indirect questions of fact, show *only* the indicative mood in this construction.[57] But we do not know how closely the most colloquial of our documents resemble spoken, vulgar Latin. The evidence from written Latin

[55] Kroll, "Randbemerkungen," *Rheinisches Museum* LXIX 106, n. 1, remarks that in Plautus shifts between the indicative and the subjunctive occur chiefly in indirect questions. The same seems to me to be true of many other authors.

[56] Cf. also Kroll, *op. cit. supra*, 106 ff.; Ströbel, *Tulliana* 25 ff.; Georg Schepss, "Die Sprache Priscillians," *Archiv für lat. Lex.* III (1886) 320.

[57] The Formulae Andegavenses show a high percentage of indicative examples, but they contain a few instances of the subjunctive. Cf. Appendix, pp. 180 ff.

points accordingly towards the use in vulgar Latin of both the indicative and the subjunctive in indirect questions of fact; but it does not prove this use.

How does the evidence from Latin agree with that furnished by the Romance languages? Modern French and Spanish employ the indicative mood in indirect questions of fact. Modern Italian uses sometimes the indicative and sometimes the subjunctive.[58] In Old French, according to Etienne, *Grammaire de l'Ancien Français* (Paris, 1895), §403, the indicative is the mood of the indirect question. The subjunctive, says Etienne, is occasionally found, "mais au sens potentiel, équivalent du conditionnel dans la langue moderne." Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des Langues Romanes* §665, cites an instance from Sursilvanian (*Sursilvain*), one of the Rhaeto-Romanic dialects, with the subjunctive mood; also an example from Dante, Enf. 22, 46 Lo duca mio gli s'accosto allato, Domandollo onde' e' fosse. The evidence gathered is, to be sure, meager. It seems, however, more probable that the use of the subjunctive in indirect questions of fact in modern Italian is a survival from Latin, than that it is an Italian development.[59] The evidence from the Romance languages points, then, in the same direction as the evidence from Latin. Vulgar Latin appears to have used both the indicative and the subjunctive in indirect questions of fact.[60]

My conclusions are opposed to those reached by Meyer-Lübke. Meyer-Lübke says, *Grammaire des Langues Romanes* §665: "Dans le parler populaire des Romains déjà, l'indicatif s'est introduit dans l'interrogation et le discours subordonnés. . . ; or, le roman ne connaît que l'usage du parler populaire de Rome. Nous avons donc un germanisme absolument incontestable et non une persistance inaltérée d'une tournure latine dans le Sursilvain. . . (here follows an instance of the subjunctive indirect question of fact). . . Au

[58] Cf. C. H. Grandgent, *Italian Grammar* (Boston, 1904) §§77 ff.: "The verb of an indirect question is nearly always in the subjunctive when it depends on a main verb either in the past tense or in the conditional." This fact is significant, in view of the similar situation in Latin. Cf. pp. 170 ff.

[59] The Romance languages have themselves developed very few uses of the subjunctive. As Meyer-Lübke remarks, §665, "Le roman se montre ici peu créateur; au contraire, il restreint plutôt l'emploi du subjonctif."

[60] There may, of course, have been local variations in vulgar Latin.

contraire, dans l'ital. Lo duca mio gli s'accosto allato, Domandollo onde' e' fosse (Enf. 22, 46) nous avons un latinisme ou un subjonctif dubitatif."[61-62] He does not mention the use of the subjunctive in indirect questions in modern Italian.[63] Meyer-Lübke was probably misled by the incorrect statements that are found in some Latin grammars (cf. pp. 169 ff.) concerning the usage in late Latin.

XIV. Application of the Results of this Paper to the Study of Latin

The main conclusion of this study, namely, that the indicative indirect question was occasionally used in the Latin of all periods and styles, should, if it is accepted, bear upon the study of Latin in three ways. In the first place, it should put an end to over-ingenious interpretations of apparent examples of indicative indirect questions. In the second place, it should influence text-criticism. It should foster a conservative attitude towards the instances of the indicative indirect question: it should discourage the emendation of the instances of the construction, and, where there is manuscript variation, it should lead to a more general application of the principle of the *lectio difficilior*. In the third place, the conclusion has a bearing upon the general question of the flexibility or rigidity of Latin syntax. If writers of all periods and styles sometimes used the indicative mood in indirect questions, Latin syntax, and particularly that of the Ciceronian age, was less stereotyped than it is sometimes said to have been.

[61] It seems to me very forced to interpret this question as dubitative (or deliberative).

[62] Similarly, Grandgent, *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (Boston, 1908), §117, remarks: "The indicative in indirect questions replaced the subjunctive in vulgar Latin."

[63] I have looked in vain, in a number of Italian grammars, for a discussion of the history of the Italian use of the subjunctive in indirect questions.

APPENDIX I

Additional Remarks on the Mood Use in Indirect Questions in Late Latin

Indicative indirect questions of fact seem to be, both absolutely and in comparison with the subjunctive ones, more frequent in late Latin writings than in those of the classical period. However, at no time, so far as I can find, was the indicative construction more common in written Latin than the subjunctive construction. In the extant writings of all periods, the subjunctive is the more usual mood in the indirect question of fact, though, to be sure, there are some documents—like the Formulae Andegavenses; cf. p. 180—which contain more instances of the indicative, than of the subjunctive, in this construction.

Observations of various scholars on the mood-usage of certain late Latin writers in indirect questions are cited here. There are added a few remarks of my own, which are based upon desultory reading.

Hoppe, *Syntax u. Stil des Tertullian* (Leipzig, 1903) pp. 72 ff., gives examples of the indicative indirect question.

In Commodian, according to H. Schneider, *Die Casus, Tempora u. Modi bei Commodian* (Nuremberg, 1889) pp. 25 ff., "finden wir den Indikativ einigemal statt des Konjunktivs in . . . indirekten Fragesätzen." Schneider cites some twelve examples.

P. Thielmann, *Über Sprache u. Kritik des lat. Apolloniusromans* (Speier, 1881) p. 40, gives examples of indicative "indirect questions" which look as if they were direct. He adds: "In welchen Fällen überall ein Imperativ vorausgeht."

A. Trabandt, *De Minoribus quae sub Nomine Quintiliani Feruntur Declamationibus* (Greifswald, 1883) p. 41, gives references to thirteen examples of the indicative indirect question.

T. Stangl, *Pseudoasconiana, Textgestaltung u. Sprache der anonymen Scholien zu Ciceros 4 ersten Verrinen* (Paderborn, 1909) pp. 24 ff., gives references to a number of instances of the indicative indirect question.

A. Delachaux, *La latinité d'Ausone* (Neuchatel, 1909) p. 109 cites two instances of the indicative in *si*-clauses which are almost certainly indirect questions.

H. Glaesener, *L'Emploi des modes chez Lactance*, *Musée Belge* IV (1900) p. 27, says that he has found only four examples of the indicative indirect question in Lactantius.

W. Hartel, "Lucifer von Cagliari u. sein Latein," *Archiv für lat. Lex.* III (1886) p. 50, remarks that the indicative indirect question is not rare in this author.

E. B. Lease, *A Syntactic, Stylistic, and Metrical Study of Prudentius* (Baltimore, 1895) p. 34, remarks: "Indirect questions . . . are for the most part in the subjunctive. I have noted but one exception. . . ."

J. A. Quillacq, *Quomodo Latina Lingua Usus Sit S. Hilarius* (Tours, 1903), remarks, p. 108: "In obliquis interrogationibus, modum indicativum supponit S. Hilarius in locum subjunctivi, contra puri sermonis consuetudinem." He cites sixteen certain or probable instances. In his first two examples, the subjunctive also is used, parallel to the indicative. Reading a few pages of Hilarius, chosen at random, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1845) X, I find the following situation. The *Liber de Synodis* shows on pp. 479-496 inclusive, some seven examples of the subjunctive and two examples of the indicative in indirect questions of fact. To be sure, in only two of the subjunctive examples is the mood use certainly due to indirectness; in several instances it may be due to attraction. In Hilarius, *Epistola ad Abram Filiam Suam* (pp. 549-552) there are five instances of the subjunctive and none of the indicative in indirect questions of fact.

For Priscillian, G. Schepps, "Die Sprache Priscillians," *Archiv für lat. Lex.* III (1886) p. 320, cites two examples of the indicative indirect question, and remarks: "Freilich steht in der Mehrzahl der Fälle, . . . richtig der Konjunktiv."

In the Peregrinatio of Aetheria (or Silvia), says E. A. Bechtel, p. 115, the subjunctive occurs seventeen times in indirect questions. There are four examples of the indicative (cited *l.c.* and in this paper).

Of Ammianus Marcellinus, G. Hassenstein, *De Syntaxi Ammiani Marcellini* (Königsberg, 1877) p. 38, remarks: "Saepissime ponit

indicativum," and cites thirty-two examples. Reading book XIV, 1-7 I find that the two moods are about evenly balanced.

L. Bayard, *Le latin de St. Cyprien* (Paris, 1902) p. 166, cites an example of an indicative indirect question with *si*. Bonnet, *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris, 1890) p. 676, n. 4, says that of the writings ascribed to Cyprian, only those which are not authentic contain instances of the indicative indirect question.

H. Goelzer, *Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de Saint Jérôme* (Paris, 1884) pp. 355 f., says that Jerome sometimes uses the indicative, but more often the subjunctive, in indirect questions.

Goelzer makes a similar remark about Avitus in his *Le latin de Saint Avit* (Paris, 1909) p. 323.

In *Grammaticae in Sulpicium Severum Observationes* (Paris, 1883) p. 56, Goelzer remarks that the indicative indirect question is employed by this author, but says nothing of its comparative frequency. There is a similar treatment of the subject in A. Loennergren, *De Syntaxi Sulpicii Severi* (Upsala, 1882) p. 72.

For Augustine, A. Regnier, *De la Latinité des Sermons de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1886) pp. 68 ff., gives many references to the indicative in the indirect question of fact. The subjunctive appears, from the little that I have read in this author, to be far more frequent in this construction, than the indicative.

F. Ferrère, "Langue et style de Victor de Vita," *Rev. de Phil.*, XXV (1901) p. 326, cites some examples of the indicative indirect question.

H. Kretschmann, *De Latinitate G. Solli Apollinaris Sidoni, Particula Altera* (Memel 1872) p. 20, cites an example of the indicative indirect question: Ep. I 11, p. 26, Videtis, ut Catullinus deperit risu? He does not say whether there are any other examples.

A. Engelbrecht cites in the index of his edition of Claudianus Mamertius (Vienna, 1885) p. 236, s.v. *indirecta*, seven examples of the indicative mood and two of the subjunctive in indirect questions. However, on reading the first fifty pages of the book, I find that the subjunctive examples are about three times as numerous as the indicative ones.

In Ennodius, A. Dubois, *La latinité d' Ennodius* (Paris, 1903) p. 444, remarks, "Le mode indicatif n'est pas moins usité que le subjonctif."

K. Meiser, in his edition of Boethius, Commentarii in Librum Aristotelis (Leipzig, 1877) p. 531, gives sixteen references to indicative indirect questions and twelve to subjunctive ones, but adds "etc." to the list of the instances with the subjunctive.

For Corippus, E. Appel, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Corippus* (Munich, 1904) p. 55, cites many examples of the indicative indirect question, and says that the subjunctive is rarely used.

L. Bergmüller, *Einige Bemerkungen zur Latinität des Jordanes* (Augsburg, 1903) p. 20, says that the indicative indirect question is frequent, and refers to the index of Mommsen, p. 190, s.v. indicativus.

In Gregory of Tours my reading shows me that the subjunctive is used far more frequently than the indicative in indirect questions of fact. Cf. also Bonnet, *Le latin de Grêgoire de Tours* (Paris, 1890) p. 676: "Le subjonctif est pourtant le mode employé le plus ordinairement."

In Hegemonius, Acta Archelai, the subjunctive seems to be used somewhat more often than the indicative. Cf. the edition of C. H. Beeson (Leipzig, 1906), Index, s.v. *Fragesätze*.

In the old Latin Bible, says J. S. McIntosh, *A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis* (Chicago, 1912) p. 117, the indicative is the regular mood in indirect questions, but the subjunctive also occurs. Of the Vulgate, F. Kaulen, *Handbuch zur Vulgata* (Mainz, 1870) §189, remarks merely that indirect questions often have the indicative mood. Rönsch, similarly, *Itala und Vulgata* (Marburg, 1875) p. 428 gives examples of the indicative construction, but says nothing of its comparative frequency.

Some desultory reading in the Agrimensores, in C. Thulin, *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum*, Vol. I Fasc. 1 (Leipzig, 1913) shows me that Frontinus, Siculus Flaccus, and Hyginus Gromaticus use the subjunctive considerably more often than the indicative in indirect questions of fact.

In the translation of the *Mulomedicina Chironis*, I find seven certain or probable examples of the indicative indirect question (cited among my examples; see Index Locorum, s.v. Hermerus) and twenty-five certain or probable instances of the subjunctive indirect question of fact.

In Vegetius I have found two certain instances and one probable instance of the indicative indirect question (cited among my examples) and eight instances of the subjunctive indirect question of fact.

In the colloquial dietetic treatise of Anthimus (early sixth century; cf. Teuffel-Schwabe-Warr, §487, 2), I find two probable examples of the indicative indirect question—ed. Valentinus Rosa (Leipzig, 1877) p. 11, 16, and p. 12, 30—and three probable examples of the subjunctive indirect question of fact.

The reading of some thirty-five pages of Ildefonsus Toletanus, a seventh century writer, in Migne, vol. 96, showed that this writer used the subjunctive more often than the indicative in our construction.

J. Pirson, "Pamphlets bas latins du VII^{e} Siècle," in M. Wilmotte, *Mélanges de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire* (Paris, 1910) vol. II, says, p. 514: "L'interrogation indirecte se construit avec l'indicatif, conformément à la tradition vulgaire." The example which he cites is a difficult one—Zeumer, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Leges, section V, Formulae, Additamentum, p. 223, 30—and is understood differently by Pirson and by Zeumer. I have read through this Additamentum and find one more example of the indicative indirect question: p. 221, 22, Transmisimus tibi de illo pane; Probato si inde potis manducare.

In *La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule* (Brussels, 1901) p. 212, Pirson cites a number of examples of the indicative indirect question.

K. Sittl, *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lat. Sprache mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des afrikanischen Lateins* (Erlangen, 1882) p. 134, says that he knows of about one hundred instances of the indicative indirect question in African Latin.

Reading a little in Joannes Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta* (Paris, 1723), I have found examples as follows: in the Formulae Andegavenses—which Mabillon, p. 388, assigns to the reign of Childebert I or II—I to XXXIX, thirteen instances of the indicative and three of the subjunctive (Formulae V, XXIV, and XXX, Mabillon, pp. 389 ff.); in Caroli Magni Epistula de Gratia Septiformis Spiritus, pp. 74 ff., seven instances of the subjunctive and one of the indicative; in Caroli Magni Epistula ad Odilbertum Archiepiscopum 76, a passage of considerable length, showing changes back and forth

between the two moods: first two examples of the subjunctive, then one indicative, five subjunctive, three indicative, two subjunctive, six indicative; in Libellus Abbatis Pirminii, De Singulis Libris Canonicis, pp. 67 ff., eight instances of the indicative and three of the subjunctive; in Leidardi Episcopi Lugdunensis Liber de Sacramento Baptismi, ad Karolum Magnum Imperatorem (Mabillon, pp. 78 ff.), thirteen instances of the subjunctive—two occurring in chapter headings—and two of the indicative—Chap. VII, where the question *may* be direct, and is, indeed, so punctuated by Mabillon; and Chap. XI—; in Alcuini Epistolae I, two instances of the subjunctive (Mabillon, p. 399).

APPENDIX II

Supplementary List of Doubtful Passages, in Most of Which the Evidence Favors the Subjunctive Reading

There are many passages in Latin literature in which there is some evidence of the occurrence of the indicative indirect question, but evidence which is inconclusive or is even overbalanced by contrary evidence. I cite here all the passages of this sort which I have found and which I have not previously mentioned.

These passages, though numerous, are not, it seems to me, of any great importance for our subject. To be sure, scholars who are prejudiced against the indicative indirect question might argue that the occurrence of numerous instances in which some manuscripts have the indicative in an indirect question, but in which the evidence favors the subjunctive, justifies one in preferring the subjunctive to the indicative *wherever* there is manuscript variation, and even in emending the instances in which the indicative is the only reading. This argument does not appear to me sound. The evidence in favor of the existence of the indicative indirect question in all periods of the history of the Latin language is so strong that the passages here cited have, it seems to me, no weight against it.

It may be that in some of the examples cited here the principle of the *lectio difficilior* should be followed and the indicative reading adopted.

It will be noted that a large proportion of the examples here given are from the younger Seneca.

The examples are of various kinds. In many passages the manuscripts vary between the indicative and the subjunctive in this construction, but favor, more or less decisively, the latter mood. Cf. Cic. Pro Caecina 33, 98:

> Quaeri hoc solere me non praeterit (ut ex me ea, quae tibi in mentem non veniunt, audias), quem ad modum, si civitas adimi non possit, in colonias Latinas saepe nostri cives profecti sint. Aut sua

voluntate aut legis multa profecti sunt; quam multam si sufferre voluissent, manere in civitate potuissent.[1]

The reading of T may be explained as a scribe's error, due to the occurrence of "profecti sunt" in the next sentence.

In other passages, the manuscripts agree in giving indicative indirect questions, but are suspected for metrical or other valid reasons. In still others, the manuscripts agree in giving subjunctive indirect questions, but metrical reasons may justify a change to the indicative. In others still, lacunae render it doubtful whether the indicative clauses under consideration, *are* indirect questions. Examples of all these kinds are indiscriminately listed.

I. Ask

1. Quid.	Varro R. R. III 12, 1
	Sen. Ep. Mor. VI 7, 9
	Sen. Nat. Quaest. I 17, 1
4. Quae, etc.	Cic. Part. Orat. 20, 68
	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXV 7
	Lucan VII 620
	Tac. Germ. 45
	Rutilius Lupus II 8
6. Qua Causa, etc.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. II 53, 1
	Sen. Nat. Quaest. IV a 2, 30
7. Quo Modo, etc.	Plaut. Poen. 1246 (1234 in Becker, p. 244)
	Cic. Pro Caecina 33, 98
	Cic. De Orat. III 31, 125
	Sen. De Ben. VII 26, 1
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XIX 4, 21
15. Quo.	Sen. De Ben. V 19, 4
	Sen. De Ben. VI 8, 3
18. Quando.	Sen. Ep. Mor. XV 1, 6
21. Unde.	Cic. Off. I 7, 23
	Sen. Nat. Quaest. III 12, 3
27. An.	Sen. Ep. Mor. V 4, 7
30. Various Connectives.	Sen. Ep. Mor. XX 2, 13

[1] *cives profecti sunt T* (one of the best codd.; according to Mueller, p. ix, the very best).

II. Inform

1. Quid.	Lucil. 987 (Non. p. 143, 33)
	Ad Heren. III 15, 27
	Cic. De Orat. II 85, 345
	Cic. Inv. I 22, 31
	Lucan VI 783
	Sen. De Ben. IV 12, 4
4. Quae, etc.	Varro R. R. I 17, 6
	Varro, R. R. II 5, 2
	Ad Heren. I 4, 6
	Cic. Inv. I 16, 22
	Cic. Inv. II 17, 54
	Cic. Att. I 19, 1
	Sall. Cat. 7, 7
	Sall. Cat. 51, 9
	Stat. Theb. IV 35
	Stat. Theb. XII 475
	Sen. Tro. 1051
	Sen. De Ben. I 11, 1
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XIV 2, 28
	Sen. Nat. Quaest. II 48, 2
6. Qua Causa, etc.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. IV b, 13, 1
	Sen. Nat. Quaest. V 11, 1
7. Quo Modo, etc.	Plaut. Poen. 1246
	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXXVIII 8
	Sen. Nat. Quaest. VI 23, 4
8. Qualis etc.	Sen. Ep. Mor. XV 3, 71
	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXXVIII 22
	Cic. Verr. Act. II, I, 8, 22
10. Quantus, etc.	Cic. Off. II, V 16
	Val. Max. 4, 3 Praef.
	Trebel. Pol. Hist. Aug. XXIV 26, 1
13. Cur.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. VII 25, 7
19. Quam.	Sall. Jug. 31, 2
	Sen. De Ben. III 16, 1
	Sen. Ep. Mor. V 8, 4
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XVII 1, 1
20. Ubi.	Plaut. Pseud. 951

23. Ut.	Manil. II 595
27. An.	Sen. Ep. Mor. XIX 4, 1
30. Various Connectives.	Sall. Jug. 17, 7
	Manil. III 561

IIB. Discuss

27. An.	Sen. Ep. Mor. I 9, 10

III. Find Out.

1. Quid.	Stat. Achil. I 737
	Stat. Theb. X 847
4. Quae, etc.	Plaut. Pseud. 4
5. Qui (*Mas. Sing. Sub.*)	Martial II 1, 3
	Sall. Cat. 44, 5
7. Quo Modo, etc.	Varro R. R. II 3, 1
13. Cur.	Cic. Orator 55, 183
30. Various Connectives.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. I Praef. 16

IIIB. Observe.

4. Quae, etc.	Plaut. Pseud. 156
	Trin. 842
	Cato Agr. Cult. VI 1
20. Ubi.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. I Praef. 12

IIID. Determine, Judge, etc.

4. Quae, etc.	Varro R. R. I 20, 1
	Cic. De Orat. III 50, 195
	Stat. Theb. VII 391
	Stat. Theb. XI 38
	Stat. Theb. XII 34
	Stat. Theb. XII 37
8. Qualis, etc.	Sall. Jug. 31, 19
10. Quantus, etc.	Cato, Agr. Cult., Introduction 1
15. Quo.	Stat. Theb. XII 662
19. Quam.	Sen. Ep. Mor. I 9, 3
	Aug. Civ. Dei VII 35 (Dombart 319, 29) according to Draeger §464
19B. Quamdiu.	Sen. Ep. Mor. XV 1, 6
27. An.	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXXVI 15

IIIE. Consider, Reflect	
1. Quid.	Cic. Inv. II 29, 89
	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXXIII 2
	Sen. De Ben. I 15, 2
4. Quae, etc.	Ad Heren. IV 4, 7
	Stat. Achil. I 200
	Val. Max. VIII 1 Praef. (Hase reads *sunt*; Kempf *sint* without critical note)
10. Quantus, etc.	Sen. Agam. 204
	Sen. Ep. Mor. IV 1, 14
19. Quam.	Sen. Ep. Mor. VII 1, 7
21. Unde.	Sen. De Ben. II 27, 3
25. Num.	Sall. Jug. 85, 29
27. An.	Sen. Suas. VI 14
30. Various Connectives.	Sen. De Ben. IV 11, 3
IV. Know.	
1. Quid.	Plaut. Stich. 604
	Pomponius Bononiensis, Ribbeck II, p. 245, 138
	Cic. Phil. II 45, 115
	Cic. Fin. II 5, 15
	Sen. De Ben. V 22, 1
	Sen. De Ben. V 23, 1
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XV 2, 50
2. Quis.	Stat. Theb. IX 315
	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXVII 14
4. Quae, etc.	Ad Heren. IV 4, 7
	Cic. Orator 51, 173
	Lucan I 490
	Stat. Theb. I 708
	Stat., Ribbeck II p. 69, 207
	Sen. Thyestes 343
	Sen. Ep. Mor. VII 3, 20
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XX 4, 21
	Sen. Nat. Quaest. VII 2, 3
6. Qua Causa, etc.	Cic. Fin. III 11, 37
	Sen. Ep. Mor XV 3, 40

7. Quo Modo, etc.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. V 7, 1
	Sen. De Ben. VII 22, 1
	Sen. Ep. Mor. IV 11, 9
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XIX 8, 30
	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXXVIII 22
8. Qualis, etc.	Trebel. Pol. Hist. Aug. XXIV 30, 5
10. Quantus, etc.	Cic. Verr. Act. II, III 18, 45
	Sall. Cat. 28, 2
	Sall. Cat. 58, 4
	Sall. Jug. 85, 3
	Lucan VII 751
	Sen. Ep. Mor. IV 5, 1
13. Cur.	Ov. Fast. III 763
16. Qua.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. I 14, 4
19. Quam.	Plaut. Most. 709
	Publilius Syrus, Ribbeck II, p. 315, 67
	Sen. De Ben. IV 34, 5
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XV 2, 58
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XIX 5, 26
20. Ubi.	Plaut. Epid. 505
21. Unde.	Lucan VII 580
	Sen. Ep. Mor. III 2, 4
22. Uter, etc.	Stat. Theb. VI 347
24. -Ne.	Lucan VII 173
26. Utrum.	Plaut. Mil. 515
27. An.	Sall. Jug. 95, 3
	Ov. Her. X 86
	Lucan IX 142
30. Various Connectives.	Cic. Cat. III 1, 3
31. Connectives Uncertain.	Caelius Antipater in Priscian VIII, p. 801, 399 H (Peter I, p. 148)

VI. See.

1. Quid.	Sen. De Ben. II 26, 1
2. Quis.	Sen. De Ben. IV 37, 5
4. Quae, etc.	Varro R. R. II 1, 18
	Cic. De Orat. I 2, 8
	Lucan VII 560
	Stat. Theb. IX 429

	Sen. Ep. Mor. I 10, 1
	Sen. De Ben. IV 10, 4
6. Qua Causa, etc.	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXXIV 1
	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXXVIII 1
7. Quo Modo, etc.	Sen. De Ben. VI 23, 5
10. Quantus, etc.	Cic. Mil. 18, 47
	Lucan V 569
	Stat. Achil. I 369
	Sen. De Clem. I 24, 1
	Sen. De Ben. IV 25, 2
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XX 6, 4
15. Quo.	Sen. Ep. Mor. V 3, 5
	Gell. I, 3, 17
17. Quatenus.	Cic. De Orat. II 58, 237
19. Quam.	Stat. Theb. VII 202
	Sen. Thy. 507
	Sen. Ep. Mor. IV 10, 2
21. Unde.	Sen. Ep. Mor. XIX 1, 8
22. Uter, etc.	Sen. Ep. Mor. II 1, 14
23. Ut.	Ter. Andr. 377
	Horace Serm. II 2, 77
	Sen. Phoen. 394
	Stat. Theb. IX 828
	Stat. Theb. X 813
	Stat. Theb. XII 252
	Stat. Theb. XII 640
	Sil. Ital. XV 85
	Apul. Met. IX 6
24. -Ne.	Sen. De Ben. III 19, 5
	Varro R. R. I 45, 2
27. An.	Cic. De Domo 45, 119
VII. Concern.	
1. Quid.	Cic. De Imp. Pomp. 15, 43
	Sen. De Ben. II 18, 7
4. Quae, etc.	Cic. De Orat. III 55, 211
	Sen. Ep. Mor. XVIII 5, 24
7. Quo Modo, etc.	Cic. Fin. V 10, 30
	Bell. Afr. XXXI 9

11. Quot.	Sen. Ep. Mor. III 7, 6
	Sen. De Ben. VII 2, 7
19. Quam.	Sen. De Ben. II 6, 1
26-27. Utrum . . . an.	Varro, Sententiae 60
27. An.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. VI 1, 9
27. No introductory particle (but *An* follows)	Sen. Ep. Mor. VI 6, 30

VIIB. Care

1. Quid.	Horace Ep. I 12, 16
24-27. -Ne . . . an.	Plaut. Trin. 102

VIII. Wonder.

1. Quid.	Plaut. Bacch. 529
	Ter. Phorm. 806

IX. It is Incredible.

19. Quam.	Sallust Cat. 6, 3

X. No Verb Expressed (Chapter Headings, etc.)

4. Quae, etc.	Cato Agr. Cult. XXXVI
	Cato Agr. Cult. XXXVII
	Varro R. R. Capitula Libri Primi (p. 115)
	Varro R. R. I 5, 3
6. Qua Causa, etc.	Varro R. R. Capitula Libri Primi (p. 115)
7. Quo Modo, etc.	Cato Agr. Cult. CXVI
11. Quot.	Varro R. R. Capitula Libri Primi (p. 115)
27. An.	Sen. De Ben. IV 1, 1

XII. Other Verbs.

1. Quid.	Plaut. Cas. 638
4. Quae, etc.	Stat. Achil. I 213

Draeger, §463, vol. II, p. 475, says: "Früher las man den Indikativ bei Val. Max. 8, 11 prf." Neither Kempf nor Hase mentions an indicative here.

Manifestly Wrong Examples of the Indicative Indirect Question

In addition to the above passages, there are a few manifestly wrong examples of the indicative indirect question. For example, in Cic. De Orat. II 52, 209, where the generally accepted reading, that of the corrector of H, is, Sed haud sciam an acerrimus longe sit omnium motus invidiae nec minus virium opus sit in ea comprimenda quam in excitanda, A E H read, in place of longe sit, non gessit. But this does not make sense. The instances which I have noted are cited below.

II. Inform

10. Quantus, etc.	Tibul. I 7, 16

III. Find out

13. Cur.	Stat. Silv. III 2, 109

IIID. Determine, Judge

27. No introductory particle (but *An* follows)	Sil. Ital. XIV 668

IV. Know

4. Quae, etc.	Lucan IX 936
27. An.	Cic. De Orat. II 52, 209

VI. See

21. Unde.	Sen. Nat. Quaest. I 14, 4
27. An.	Sen. Ep. Mor. XVIII 3, 5

VII. Concern

26. Utrum.	Sen. De Ben. VI 34, 5
27. An.	Sen. Ep. Mor. LXXXVI 9

APPENDIX III

Relative (Quis) Quid

I. Introductory

Gaffiot[1] maintains that the dependent indicative clauses with *quis* or *quid*, which are used after verbs of asking, informing, etc., are not indirect questions but relative clauses. He cites, in support of this theory, seven passages from Plautus "où il est impossible d'attribuer au pronom une valeur interrogative" (*Pour le Vrai Latin*, pp. 53-54);[2] a larger number of passages of the type under debate (like Pseud. 330, Audin quid ait Iuppiter; Rud. 948, Eloquere quid id est) (pp. 55-63 and 68-71); and a considerable number of examples of (*quis*) *quid*-clauses used after *non habeo*, *nihil habeo*, *deest*, or the like (pp. 73 ff.).

Lattmann[3] argues, in opposition to Gaffiot, that relative (*quis*) *quid* is an indefinite relative, a survival of that usage in which (*quis*) *quid* was largely displaced by (*quisquis*) *quicquid*. It is not, he says, the equivalent of (*qui*) *quod*. Ernout[4] likewise opposes Gaffiot's theory. There are no examples, he says, like *templum, quid erat Romae, incendio deletum est.* Gaffiot replies (*Rev. de phil.*, p. 63): "*Quis, quid* étant substantif ne doit pas avoir d'antécédent substantif. . . . Dans le passage du Pseud. 261 . . . *nosce saltem hunc, quis est. Iam diu scio qui fuit*, il ne faut pas considérer *hunc* comme l'antécédent de *quis*. La proposition *nosce saltem hunc* a son sens complet: 'Cherche au moins à connaître la personne qui est là'; mais, par un redoublement fréquent dans le style familier . . ., la relative *quis est* renforce et précise l'invitation. Nous dirions d'une façon analogue en français, et familièrement: "Cherche au moins à connaître cet individu, celui que c'est, son nom." De même on conçoit très bien une phrase comme celle-ci: *mihi praesto fuit amicus tuus, quis idem ac tu contendit.*"

[1] "(Quis) Quid Relatif," in *Pour le vrai Latin* (Paris, 1909) 51 ff. and *Rev. de phil.* XXXIV (1910) 57 ff.

[2] These are cited below, p. 194.

[3] "Der Kampf um das echte Latein," *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* XXX (July 24. 1909), cited by Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.* XXXIV 63.

[4] *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique*, p. 57, cited by Gaffiot, *Rev. de phil.* XXXIV 61.

That (*quis*)*quid* was sometimes used in early Latin as an indefinite relative, in the sense of (*quisquis*) *quicquid*, seems to be certain. There remains a question, however, as to whether this pronoun was ever used in the sense of (*qui*) *quod*. Gaffiot's remark, "On conçoit . . .," cited above, of course proves nothing. To prove that (*quis*) *quid* was sometimes used in the sense of *qui* (*quod*), Gaffiot points to Plaut. Men. 1129 and Pseud. 1189 (*Rev. de phil.*, XXXIV [1910] p. 64). However, the reading of these examples is doubtful. See below, p. 196.

Further, the use of (*quis*) *quid*, both as a definite, and as an indefinite, relative, remains to be studied. Gaffiot, *Pour le vrai latin*, pp. 68 ff., has collected a number of examples from Cicero's letters, of the alleged use of relative (*quis*)*quid*. However, with the exception of clauses used with *non habeo* and the like, all of Gaffiot's instances from Cicero occur with verbs which may be followed by indirect questions; e.g., *quaero*, *scio*. Indeed Gaffiot himself concludes, *Pour le vrai latin*, p. 77, that in the Ciceronian age, "*quid* subsiste comme relatif, dans le style familier, là seulement, où il pourrait être interrogatif." In other words, Gaffiot has no clear example of relative (*quis*) *quid* from the Ciceronian age. All of his examples from this period may be interpreted as instances of the indicative indirect question. The field of later Latin Gaffiot leaves untouched.

I have happened upon a number of apparent examples of relative (*quis*) *quid*, chiefly from late Latin, which Gaffiot does not cite. They made me wonder whether Gaffiot might not have understated the argument for his theory. Accordingly, I have collected all the examples that I could readily find, which might conceivably be added to his list.[5] They are cited below, along with those of Gaffiot's examples which seem to me pertinent. I have excluded the passages of the type under debate, i.e., apparent instances of the indicative indirect question, like Pseud. 330, Audin quid ait Iuppiter. It is not justifiable to use these passages in proof of the existence of

[5] Most of the examples are taken from Kroll, "Der lateinische Relativsatz" *Glotta* III 3; *Stolz-Schmalz*, 529; Neue-Wagener II (ed. 3, Berlin, 1892) 430 f.; Schöndörffer, *De Genuina Catonis Libri Forma*, part I (Koenigsberg, 1885) 82; Wolff, *De Enuntiatis Interrog. apud Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium* 27; Löfstedt, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der späteren Latinität* (Stockholm, 1907) 455 f. A few examples have been gathered independently.

relative (*quis*) *quid*. They would be of use only as corroborative evidence. I have excluded also the stereotyped *quidvis* and *quidlubet*, and the examples of *quid*-clauses used with *non habeo*, *nihil habeo*, *deest*, or the like.[6] Gaffiot himself, *Pour le vrai latin*, p. 77, leaves these examples, in a way, out of the reckoning, "puisque quid s'y est, pour bien dire, cristallisé et ne participe plus à la vie de la langue."

I have divided the examples into two groups, citing first the evidence for the use of (*quis*) *quid* as an indefinite relative, and then the evidence for its use as a definite relative.

II. Evidence for the Use of (*Quis*) *Quid*, in the Sense of (*Quisquis*) *Quicquid*

XII tabb. I 4 (Schoell, p. 116): Proletario iam civi quis uolet uindex esto.

XII tabb. II 2 (Schoell, p. 120): Morbus sonticus . . . aut status dies cum hoste—*quid* horum *fuit* unum iudici arbitrove reove, eo dies diffissus esto.

Cato Agr. Cult. 145, I Keil (91, 16 according to Schöndörffer, De Genuina Forma, p. 82): Homines eos dato, qui placebunt aut custodi aut quis eam oleam emerit.

Cato Agr. Cult. 148 Keil (93, 7 and again 93, 18, Schöndörffer, De Genuina Forma, p. 82): Dominus uino quid uolet faciet.

[6] All of Gaffiot's examples of *quid*-clauses after *non habeo* and the like are from Cicero. I have found two examples of this sort in Plautus: Mil. 407, Nil habeo certi quid loquar; and Aul. 349, Ibi si perierit quippiam . . ., Dicant: coqui apstulerunt, comprehendite, Vincite, verberate, in puteum condite. Horum tibi istic nihil eueniet (quippe qui Ubi *quid* surripias nihil est).

The history of this use of the *quid*-clause may perhaps be parallel to that of the corresponding Greek construction, and go back to the deliberative question. This possibility is suggested by W. G. Hale, " 'Extended' and 'Remote' Deliberatives in Greek," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* XXIV (1893) 174, n. 1.

Cato Agr. Cult. 59, 3 (Schöndörffer, p. 82): Orbes, fibulas . . . omnia quis usus erit in suo quidque loco reponite.

Plaut. Merc. 991: Supplici sumat quid uolt ipsi ob hanc iniuriam.[7]

Amph. 396: Quid tibi lubet fac.

Bacch. 866: Pacisce ergo, opsecro, quid tibi lubet.

Pers. 398: Vel tu me vende vel face quid tibi lubet.

Trin. 570: Quid tibi lubet tute agito cum nato meo.

Poen. 881: Quid ergo dubitas quin lubenter tuo ero meus quid possiet
Facere faciat male, eius merito?[8]

Ep. 651: Quod boni est, id tacitus taceas tute tecum et gaudeas.[9]

Ephem. Epigr. II 298 (an early inscription from Luceria): Sei quis aruorsu hac faxit, [in] ium quis uolet pro ioudicatod n(unum) [L.] manum iniect[i]o estod.

Cic. Legg. 3, 4, 10: Ast quid erit, quod extra magistratus coerari oesus sit, qui coeret, populus creato.

Cic. Legg. 3, 4, 11: Ast quid turbassitur in agendo, fraus actoris esto.

Sen. Apoc. 9, 15: Censeo uti divus Claudius ex hac die deus sit, ita uti ante eum quis optimo iure factus sit.[10]

Festus (a plebiscite; s.v. *publica pondera*, p. 246 Mueller): Quis volet magistratus multare . . . liceto.

[7] Leo comments: "*quod* Bothius non recte."

[8] *Quid* A C D Leo, Goetz-Schoell; *quod* B, Lindsay.

[9] *quid* B (perhaps an error due to the fact that the preceding verse begins with *quid*).

[10] Thus Sangall., "codex optimus."

Festus (Foedus Latinum; s.v. *nancitor*, p. 166 Mueller): Pecuniam quis nancitor, habeto.

Gellius 4, 12, 2: Item, quis eques Romanus equum habere gracilentum aut parum nitidum visus erat, 'impolitiae' notabatur.[11]

Gellius 13, 23, 8: Quis erat egregia ac praestanti fortitudine, Nero appellatus est.[12]

Iul. Capit. Hist. Aug. XIX (Maxim. Duo) 28, 10: Quod idcirco indidi, ne quis Cordum legeret, me praetermisisse crederet aliquid, quod ad patrem pertineret.[13]

Commod. Apol. 265 f.: Nam lapis immissus ipse est in fundamenta Sion, crederet in quo quis haberet vitam aeternam.

CIL XI 1497: Quis autem . . . uoluerit corpus supra ponere . . . hic inferet aerario.

Venantius Fortunatus Carm. I 16, 34: Ineptus est quis ipse se praeferre uolt ecclesiae.

Venantius Fortunatus Vita S. Hilarii 5, 16: Quoniam, ut dictum est, quis perversus voluit confligere ac si mutus et claudus nec verba poterat praeferre nec currere.

Cyprianus Gallus Heptat. Exod. 1083: Multaque praeterea rerum commenta novarum
Mirificis sunt facta modis, quae dicere quis vult,
Expromet citius pelagus quas volvat harenas.

[11] Thus Q. See Hertz *ad loc.*

[12] Thus Q. See Hertz *ad loc.*

[13] *quis* B P M *qui* V(?) Peter.

Eugen. Epist. III 5: Quid ergo hac occasione vel deliquerim vel deliqui vobis imputari iubete.

Hilar. in Psalm. 132, I: Neque quid iucundum est, bonum est.

The preceding examples establish the use of (*quis*) *quid* as an indefinite relative, both in early and in late Latin.[14] It will be noted that, except for the archaistic[15] De Legibus of Cicero, there are no instances in the Latin writings of the period between Plautus and Seneca.

III. Evidence for the Use of (*Quis*) *Quid* in the Sense of (*Qui*) *Quod*

XII tabb. III 3 (Schoell, p. 122): Ni iudicatum faciat aut quis endo eo in iure uindicit, secum ducito.

It seems more natural to regard *quis* in this example as equivalent to *qui* than as equivalent to *quisquis*.

Plaut. Most. 918: Me suasore atque impulsore id factum audacter dicito,
Qui subegi faenore argentum ab danista ut sumeret,
Quod isti dedimus arraboni.[16]

Poen. 1370: Nunc, quod postremumst condimentum fabulae,
Si placuit, plausum postulat comoedia.[17]

Pseud. 1189: Mea quidem haec habeo omnia,
Meo peculio empta. *Bal.* Nempe quid femina summa sustinent.[18]

Men. 1129: Auos noster mutauit; quod tibi nomen est, fecit mihi.[19]

[14] In Oscan, similarly, the corresponding form of the pronoun, i.e., (*pis*) *pid* is used as an indefinite relative; cf. Buck, *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, §198.

[15] For the archaistic language of the De Legibus, cf. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* (Munich, 1909) I 2, 349.

[16] *quod* P. *quid* A (*qui* in the preceding line may have caused an error in copying).

[17] *quod* A: *quid* B.

[18] *quid* B: *qu-*A: *quod* C D.

[19] *quod* second hand of B, C D: *quid* first hand of B.

Poen. 1212: *Ad.* Quis reuocat? *Ag.* Qui bene uolt uobis facere.[20]

The preceding *quis* may have caused an error in copying.[21]

Ter. H. T. 638: Quam bene vero abs te prospectumst
Quid uoluisti cogita.[22]

Cic. Att. X 10, 4: Ocellam cuperem, si possem palam, quid acuone effeceram.[23]

Petron. 50: Ignoscetis mihi quid dixero.[24]

Rutilius Lupus II 10: Hoc schema efficitur, cum quaerimus, quid aut quemadmodum pro rei dignitate dicimus, nec reperire nos ostendimus.

Carm. Epigr. (Bücheler) 520, 7 (Ephem. Epigr. V 1049) (3d cent. A.D.): Et quid [non m]ulti poterant iuvene[s], hic semper solus a[gebat.

Amm. Mar. XIV 11, 11: Qui eum . . . proficisci pellexit vultu adsimulato saepius replicando, quod flagrantibus votis eum videre frater cuperet patruelis, *quid* per imprudentiam *gestum est* remissurus, ut mitis et clemens.[25]

Venantius Fortunatus Vita S. Martini IV 440: Ni cito subvenias, rapit omnia pestis acerba,
Per spatium ferale trahens in Tartara cunctos,
Et grassata diu quid agant contagia perdunt.

Past. Herm. Vis. 3, 3, 3: Quid ergo nunc vis, interrogare (infinitive for imperative; from Stolz-Schmalz, p. 529).

[20] *qui* P: *quis* A.

[21] A shows a similar error in Pers. 636, where *quae fuit* has been copied as *qui fuit*, owing to the presence of *qui fuit* two verses below.

[22] *quid* codd.; *quod* Bothe, Tyrrell.

[23] So M. Editors emend to *quod a Curione.*

[24] *quod* Muncker, Buecheler.

[25] <*si*>*quid* Kiessling, Clark: *quod* E B G.

Greg. H. F. VI 40 (p. 280, 18): Certe si oppilatas habeas aures, ut ista non audias, crede apostolis, *quid* in monte *audierunt*, cum transfiguratus Iesus in gloria loqueretur cum Moysi et Helia.[26]

Do the examples in group II establish the use of (*quis*) *quid* as a relative pronoun equivalent to *qui* (*quod*)?

In weighing the evidence, we should reject those passages in which the dependent clauses may have some interrogative coloring. Thus, the Terence example may be an instance of confusion of the relative and interrogative clause, for the verb *prospicere* is such as might be followed by either construction. In the Rutilius passage, similarly, the clause under discussion, following, as it does, the verb *quaerimus*, may be an instance of confusion, or may, indeed, actually be an indirect question. In the passage from Vita S. Mart., it may well be that the *quid*-clause after *perdere* is an extension from the *quid*-clause after *non habere* and the like (cf. p. 193, n. 6). In Greg., H. F. VI 40, the *quid*-clause seems to be an indirect question, after the implication in *crede*: "believe them telling . . ."—"believe their account of. . . ."

The Cicero passage has no weight; for there is text corruption, and the meaning is obscure.

In every one of the Plautus passages there is manuscript variation. Still, though there are no clear cases in Plautus of *quis* used in the sense of relative *qui*, some consideration must be given to the *lectio difficilior*.

The example from the Twelve Tables is not a clear instance of the use of *quis* in the sense of *qui*. It might be possible to interpret *quis* in this example as equivalent to *quisquis*.

There remain four passages from late Latin: from Petronius, Carmina Epigraphica—a third century inscription—, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Pastor Hermes. It seems, then, that (*quis*) *quid* was occasionally, but very rarely, used, in late Latin, in the sense of (*qui*) *quod*. There is some evidence for this usage in early Latin, but evidence which is not conclusive.

[26] *Audierint* A 1.

IV. Conclusion

How do we stand, then, with regard to Gaffiot's theory, that the dependent indicative clauses with (*quis*) *quid* which look like indirect questions, are really relative clauses?

In the first place, there are no clear examples of relative (*quis*) *quid* in the writings of the period between Plautus and Seneca.[27] It would, accordingly, be unjustifiable to interpret as relative clauses the apparent examples of the indicative indirect question with (*quis*) *quid* which occur in this period.

In the second place, for early and late Latin a distinction must be made between the use of (*quis*) *quid* in the sense of (*quisquis*) *quicquid* and its use in the sense of (*qui*) *quod*. Instances of the former usage are infrequent, but quite certainly occurred, both in early and in late Latin. The use, on the other hand, of (*quis*) *quid* in the sense of *qui quod* occurred very rarely indeed in late Latin (I know of four clear cases) and possibly, but not certainly, occurred in early Latin.

Since the examples of the use of (*quis*) *quid* in the sense of (*qui*) *quod* are so very rare, it is never justifiable, as it seems to me, to interpret apparent instances of indicative indirect questions with (*quis*) *quid* as examples of this use. On the other hand, whenever, in early or late Latin, an apparent instance of an indicative indirect question with (*quis*) *quid* can be interpreted as an *indefinite* relative clause—(*quis*) *quid* being equivalent to (*quisquis*) *quisquid*—this interpretation is conceivably correct. Thus, *quid* may conceivably be relative in Plaut., Cist. 57, *Eloquere utrumque nobis. Et quid tibist et quid velis nostram operam;* for it would be possible to employ *quicquid* in such an example. On the other hand, *quid* is not to be interpreted as relative in Merc. 783, *Fortasse te illum mirari coquum quod venit atque haec attulit. Dicam id quid est;* for here the reference in the *quid*-clause is to something that is represented by the speaker as being quite definite in his mind. If *quid* were relative, it would be used in the sense of *quod*; but this usage is not established for early Latin. In late Latin, while the usage occurs, it is too rare to justify the interpretation of apparent examples of (*quis*) *quid* with indicative indirect questions, as instances of the use of (*quis*) *quid* in the sense of (*qui*) *quod*.

[27] Except in the archaistic De Legibus of Cicero. See p. 196, n. 15.

As there are a number of dependent indicative (*quis*) *quid*-clauses in Plautus that cannot be regarded as indefinite relative clauses,[28] and as there are, moreover, a number of dependent indicative (*quis*) *quid*-clauses in the Latin between the time of Plautus and of Seneca—the period for which, except in the archaistic *De Legibus*, there are no examples of relative (*quis*) *quid*—it results that Gaffiot's theory cannot account for all of the apparent examples of the indicative indirect question with (*quis*) *quid*. Now, apart from (*quis*) *quid*-clauses, there are in Latin a considerable number of certain instances of the indicative indirect question. Cf. pp. 96 ff. There is, accordingly, no real difficulty in interpreting (*quis*) *quid*-clauses with the indicative as indirect questions.

The correct interpretation of practically all the apparent examples of indicative indirect questions introduced by (*quis*) *quid* is, it seems to me, that they *are* indirect questions. However, when, in early and in late Latin, the context admits of the interpretation of (*quis*) *quid* as an *indefinite* relative, this interpretation is to be acknowledged as conceivably correct.

Gaffiot's theory has somewhat more in its favor as regards *quis* than as regards *quid*. Indeed, the apparent examples of relative *quis* outnumber those of interrogative *quis* with the indicative which are cited on the pages referred to above, twelve to three. Further, all these apparent examples of interrogative *quis* occur in early and late Latin, periods within which examples of relative *quis* are found. However, it seems to me very improbable that the three *quis*-clauses which occur with verbs that may introduce indirect questions are relative clauses.

In classifying the examples in the body of this study, I have, in accordance with the conclusions mentioned above, used the following method. In early Latin, through Plautus, and in the post-Augustan period, I have never classed a (*quis*) *quid*-clause as a certain instance of an indirect question, if the context admitted of the interpretation that it was an indefinite relative clause, with (*quis*) *quid* equivalent to (*quisquis*) *quicquid*. In the intervening period I have regarded (*quis*) *quid* as always interrogative.

[28] For the examples see pp. 97, 101, and 102.

APPENDIX IV

The Interrogative Use of "Si"

The opinions of various scholars concerning the use of *si* to introduce indirect questions are cited on pp. 75 ff. It seems to me that the earliest certain example is Ter. Hec. 321. This passage is interpreted differently by Gaffiot (cf. above, p. 103); but his interpretation seems to me impossible.

Among our probable examples of indirect questions with *si*, are a number from both Plautus and Terence (cf. pp. 81 ff.). If we assume, in view of the occurrence of these probable examples, that *si* sometimes introduced indirect questions as early as Plautus, what shall we say of the fact that there are no *certain* examples in Plautus? In answering this question, we must bear in mind that only under exceptional circumstances can certain examples of interrogative *si* occur. Absolutely certain instances of the indirect question with *si* must be rare; for, in the nature of the case, it is nearly always possible to interpret a *si*-clause in a different way. One may "inquire whether . . ." or "make inquiry, in case (on the chance that) . . ." One may say, "Tell me whether you have seen him," or "If you have seen him, tell me so"; "I want to find out whether he has come," or "If he has come, I want to find it out"; and so on, down the entire list of verbs that may introduce indirect questions. It is to be expected that, even if *si* was freely used to introduce indirect questions, the absolutely certain instances of the construction should be rare. Accordingly, it seems to me far more probable that *si* sometimes introduced indirect questions as early as Plautus, than that all the apparent examples from this author (cited pp. 81 ff.)—some of which, indeed, can only by forcing be interpreted otherwise than as indirect questions—are to be explained away.

The use of the particle *si* to introduce indirect questions occurs, then, as it seems to me, certainly in Terence, and in all probability in Plautus. It occurs also in Cicero and Virgil (with the subjunctive; see below), and in Propertius, Lygdamus, Livy, and Vitruvius (see pp. 96, 99, and 100), and in all probability in Horace (see p. 84

and below). In later Latin, the construction occurs in Tertullian, Jerome, Sulpicius Severus, Augustine, and Gregory (cf. pp. 144, 147, 150, 154, 155, and 156) and in all probability in Commodian and Ausonius (cf. pp. 139-140). There are doubtless many more examples in late Latin than I have observed.

If *si* was used to introduce indirect questions, one would expect to find examples with the subjunctive mood. Such instances do occur, though in classical Latin rather infrequently. The earliest certain example is Cic., Inv. II 42, 122, Ambigunt agnati cum eo, qui est heres, si filius ante quam in suam tutelam veniat, mortuus sit. There is an instance in Virgil (where, however, the question is one not of fact, but of deliberation): Aen. I 218, Spemque metumque inter dubii, seu vivere credant, Sive extrema pati nec iam exaudire vocatos. Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 25, *Rev. de phil.*, XXXII, p. 52, gives an interpretation which seems to me impossible. There are instances in Propertius—II 34, 54 (cited p. 96) and II 3, 5 (cf. Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit*, p. 36),—Livy—IV, 20, 8; XXIX 25, 8; XXXIX 50, 7; XL 49, 6[1]—and Vitruvius (cf. Morgan, *On the Language of Vitruvius*, pp. 487 ff.).[2]

There are, besides, the following practically certain examples: Cic. Inv. II 29, 87, Hoc in genere primum, sicut in ceteris, si quid aut ex coniecturali aut ex alia constitutione sumi possit, videri oportebit; Virgil, Aen. IV 111, Sed fatis incerta feror, si Iuppiter unam Esse velit Tyriis urbem Troiaque profectis Miscerive probet populos aut foedera iungi;[3] Horace, Ep. I 6, 41, Chlamydes Lucullus ut aiunt, Si posset centum scenae praebere rogatus, Qui possum tot? ait;[4]

[1] The last three examples, Gaffiot, *Ecqui fuerit* 31 ff., concedes to be indirect questions. However, he thinks that in these passages *si* retains its conditional force (*Ecqui fuerit* 33); and in *Le prétendu emploi* 47 he says that these passages *seem* interrogative, but are not really so. I regard Livy XXXI 9, 8 as an additional example of the subjunctive indirect question. It is so considered by Riemann-Goelzer, p. 410. Gaffiot's interpretation, *Ecqui fucrit* 31, is forced.

[2] In Vitruv. II 8, 19 Morgan, p. 488, considers the *si*-clause a conditional protasis "used instead of" an indirect question. It seems to me impossible to interpret the clause as anything else than an indirect question. The passage reads: De ipsa autem testa, si sit optima seu vitiosa ad structuram, statim nemo potest iudicare.

[3] Gaffiot's interpretation, *Ecqui fuerit* 25, seems very unnatural.

[4] Gaffiot considers the *si*-clause a condition. His interpretation would be: "Asked to furnish a hundred cloaks if he could." I know of no parallel for the use of an infinitive with the verb *rogare*.

Ovid, Met. XI 678, Voce sua specieque viri turbata soporem Excutit: et primo si sit circumspicit illic, Qui modo visus erat.

Further, there are probable instances in Terence: Adel. 549, Nunc redeo; si forte frater redierit, viso;[5] and H. T. 618, Abi nunciam intro, atque illa si iam laverit, mihi nuntia.[6-7]

As regards later Latin, there are instances of *si* introducing subjunctive indirect questions, e.g., in Tertullian (cf. Hoppe, p. 73), and Gregory (Hist. Fr. V 39 [p. 232, 7)]. In Val. Fl. 5, 561, Expertique simul, si tela artusque sequantur, the *si*-clause may be either an indirect question or a loosely attached condition.[8]

Schmalz, p. 519, after citing indirect questions with *si* in Propertius and Livy, states: "In der Folgezeit ist der Gebrauch nicht nachzuweisen. Er bürgerte sich erst durch den Einfluss der Übersetzungslitteratur, so besonders der Vulg. ein, überlebte alle anderen

[5] Gaffiot takes the *si*-clause as a true condition, with verb in the future perfect, depending upon *viso*, a present used in a future sense. The passage does not naturally mean what Gaffiot would have it mean: "If my brother shall have returned, I shall see him"; but rather, "I am looking to see if my brother has returned." The only question, to my mind, is whether the *si*-clause is loosely attached and *si* means "in case," or whether the clause is closely attached and *si* means "whether." On the former interpretation, *redierit* would be a future perfect, expressing the discovery in the future of an act which has, in the present time, taken place. It would correspond to the use of the future as in Phorm. 801, Sic erit ("You'll find it to be so"). It seems more natural to understand the *si*-clause as an indirect question with verb in the subjunctive. Becker (p. 196) understands it so.

[6] Gaffiot considers the verb a future perfect indicative and interprets: "Si iam laverit, id mihi nuntia" (*Ecqui fuerit* 22).

[7] In the following passages the *si*-clauses may possibly be indirect questions, but can well be understood as loosely attached conditions: Ter. Phorm. 490, Mirabar si tu mihi quicquam adferres novi (Sargeaunt considers the *si*-clause a condition: "I thought it would be a wonder if you'd anything new to say to me." For the use of a condition with *miror*, cf. p. 76, n. 10. Morgan understands the clause as an indirect question: "I wondered whether you had anything new to bring forward."); Caes. B. G. I 8 fin. Helvetii . . . nonnumquam interdiu, saepius noctu, si perrumpere possent conati; B. G. II 9, Hanc si nostri transirent, hostes expectabant; B. C. II 34, Hanc uterque si adversariorum copiae transire conarentur, expectabat; Cic. Phil. IX I, 2, Non recusavit quominus vel extremo spiritu si quam opem rei publicae ferre posset, experiretur; Livy I 57, 3, Temptata res est, si primo impetu capi Ardea posset; II 35, 4; X 16, 5; XXI 45, 3.

[8] Here, as elsewhere in this study, I use the term "condition" to designate all kinds of *si*-clauses except indirect questions.

indirekten Fragewörter, und ging dann auch allein in die romanischen Sprachen über." It seems to be true that there are no certain examples of interrogative *si* between the Augustan age and the time of Tertullian. However, possible examples occur as follows: two in Seneca (see pp. 139 and 140), two in Columella (pp. 140 and 141), one in Petronius (p. 139), and one in Apuleius (p. 141).

Two different explanations of the interrogative use of *si* have been suggested. Some scholars consider the construction a Grecism. Cf. Gaffiot, *Le prétendu emploi* 47; Thielmann, *Über Sprache u. Kritik des lat. Apolloniusromans* (*Speier, 1881*) *40*; Schneider, *Die Casus, Tempora, und Modi bei Commodian* (Nuremberg, 1889) 26. Other scholars regard it as a colloquialism. Cf. Riemann, *op. cit.*, p. 31; Marx, *op. cit.*, p. 445. The latter view seems to me to be correct. To be sure, some translators of Greek may have been, in part, influenced by the occurrence of εἰ in their originals.

In late Latin *si* sometimes introduced direct, as well as indirect, questions. Cf. Hatfield, *A Study of Iuvencus* (Bonn, 1890) p. 21; Kaulen, *Handbuch zur Vulgata* (Mainz, 1870) §189; Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata* (Marburg, 1875) p. 404; Hoppe, *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian* (Leipzig, 1903) p. 73, n. 1. The direct question with *si* would seem to have developed from the indirect question, in consequence of an ellipsis of the introductory verb. For such a development in the case of various kinds of clauses, cf. Brugmann, *Kurze vgl. Gram.* §942.

INDEX LOCORUM

Index of Citations from Latin Writings[1]

I To the End of the Augustan Age

Accius

Ribbeck I, p. 160, 191–**20**; p. 176, 303–**40**; p. 192, 432–**45**; p. 201, 499–**14**.

Ad Herennium

General–**xviii** n. 7. I 6, 10–**90**; **97**. I 10, 17–**62**. II 20, 31–**66**. II 31, 50–**58**. III 7, 13–**58**. IV 9, 13–**93**; **104**. IV 12, **17–61**. IV 56, 69–**62**.

Afranius

Ribbeck II, p. 176, 91–**40**.

Bellum Africum–**164** n. 21.

Caecilius Statius

Ribbeck II, p. 42, 43–**98**; p. 71, 216–**36**.

Caesar

General–**161** n. 8 and n. 9. B. G. I 20, **6–58**. In Cic. Att. IX 7C, 1–**77**, **78**.

Calvus, C. Licinius Macer–**7**.

Cato

Agr. Cult. VI 4–**XX**; **18**; **93**.

Headings in Agr. Cult.; X–**138**. XI–**138**. XIII–**137**. CXLII–**138**.

Orig. Fr. 95 b–**33**.

Catullus

General–**163** n. 14 and n. 16; **164**; **167** n. 34. 61, 78–**40**. 61, 99–**41**. 62, 8–**40**. 69, 10–**25**; **28**; **159**.

Celsus

Headings: II 7–**138**. II 8–**138**.

Cicero

General–**xviii** n. 7; **160** n. 6; **165** n. 26; **168** n. 43.

Acad. Prior. II 15, 46–**100**.

Att.: I 19, 4–**102**. II 10–**15**; **106** n. 1. III 7, 3–**103**. III 23, 4–**85**. IV 5, **1–43**; **159**. V 20, 7–**24**. VI 4, 3–**55** n. 27. VII 12, 1–**88**; **97**. VII 12, 2–**20**. VII 26, 3–**87**; **97**. VIII 2, 2–**15**. VIII 11, 5–**25**; **26**. VIII 13, 2–**37**. IX 7 A, 2 (Balbus)–**47**. IX 7 C, (Caesar)–**77**; **78**. IX 13, 3–**68**. X 12, 4–**102**. X 12 A, 2–**38**. X 16, 2–**47**. X 18, 1–**51**. XI 19, 1–**97**. XII 2, 1–**50**. XII 40, 3–**53**; **56**. XIII 18, 1–**36**. XIII 30, 3–**65**. XIV 13, 2–**20**. XV 13, 6–**8**; **11**.

Cat.: II 3, 5–**102**.

C. M.: 4, 12–**52**. 6, 18–**55**; **59**.

De Leg.: I 9, 27–**61**.

De Orat.: II 11, 45–**50**. II 42, 180–**38**. II 60, 243–**109**. II 65, 261–**8**. II 70, 283–**76**.

Deorum Nat.: II 6, 18–**57**. II 44, 113 (verse)–**40**.

Div.: I 38, 82–**46**. II 49, 101–**46**.

Fam.: II 9, 1–**68**. IV 5, 4 (Sulpicius)–**46**. VI 9, 2–**104**. VII 4–**104**; **106n.**: VIII 1, 2–**59**. VIII 15, 1 (Caelius)–**103**. XII 13, 3–**46**. XII 15, 6 (Lentulus)–**65**. XIV 17–**71**. XVI 27, 2–**43**; **159**.

Fin.: IV 24, 67–**66**. V 9, 24–**69**.

Flac.: 32, 80–**12**; **171 n. 51**.

Har. Resp.: 17, 37–**93**; **97**.

In Toga Candida:–**18**.

Inv.: I 28, 43–**24**; **27**; **171n. 51**. II 12, 39–**72**.

Lael.: 15, 55–**54**; **68**; **172**. 25, 96–**32**; **34**.

Leg. Agr.: II 4, 15–**61**. II 18, 49–**59**.

Off.: II 7, 23–**98**.

Pro Milone: 10, 29–**63**; **99**.

Quint Fratr.: III 7, 2–**46**.

Rep.: I 19, 31–**11**; **12**; **107n. 2**; **166n. 32**.

Rosc. Am: 34, 95–**71**.

Tusc.: I 13, 29–**26**; **107n. 2**. IV 36, 77–**50**. V 41, 121–**62**.

[1] The index covers the body of this book, and Appendix I. The references in boldface type are to pages of this book.

Verr. Act. II: I 8, 32–**100**. I 28, 72–**22**. II 53, 131–**65**. II 73, 179–**46**. III 26, 64–**xix n. 8; 70**. III 77, 180–**79**. IV 60, 135–**46**.
Q. Cic. De Petit.: **1**, 3–**49**. 9, 35–**48**.
Ennius in Non. p. 150, 6 (Annales VI; Vahlen 210)–**36**.
Horace
General–**163n. 14** and **n. 15**.
Ep.: 1 7, 39–**xxvii; xxviii n. 26; 79**; **84**.
Serm.: II 4, 38–**xxviii n. 26; 53; 68; 167 n. 36; 168n. 40**.
Laberius
Ribbeck II, p. 282, 20–**74**; p. 295, 104–**41**.
Livy
General–**160n. 5**. XXII 36, 1–**98**. XXXI 7, 8–**98n. 35**. XXXIV 3, 5–**95**; **96**. XLI 24, 4–**66**. XLI 24, 5–**102**; **172**.
Lucilius
375–**12n. 11; 25; 27: n. 51**. 604–**142**.
Lucretius
General–**163**; **163n. 14** and **n. 17**; **165n. 28**; **166n. 33**; **168n. 43**. I 269–**71**. II 765–**47**. II 814–**73**. IV 290–**28**. IV 1204–**38**. VI 811–**42**.
Lygdamus III 1, 19–**95**; **99**.
Manilius
II 435–**48**. IV 117–**53**; **73**. LV 211–**69**. IV 919–**109**.
Naevius—no examples of the indicative indirect question.
Nepos
164n. 21.
Ovid
Ars Am.: II 529–**72**. III 115–**72**.
Ex Ponto: I 8, 25–**70**. III 3, 3–**47**.
Her.: VII 53–**102**. IX 122–**47**. X 79–**47**. XV 4–**70**; **170n. 50**.
Ibis: 199–**62**.
Met.: X 637–**xxvi**; **xxviii n. 26**; **102**; **166n. 31**; **169**. XII 473–**66**. XIII 206–**47**.
Rem. Am.: 683–**11**; **14**; **159**.
Trist.: I, III 52–**73**. I, IX 9–**73**. IV, X **44–60**.
Pacuvius
Ribbeck I, p. 113, 294–**20**; p. 132, 407–**49**.
Phaedrus
161 n. 10.
Plautus
General–**169n. 46**; **161n. 11**; **166n. 30**.
Amph.: 17–**52**; **57**. 45–**58**. 50–**45**. 133–**45**. 360–**23**. 417–**45**. 421–**7**. 424–**85**. 442–**54**; **67**. 460–**xxii**; **55**; **63**. 507–**33**. 559–**63**. 599–**47**. 773–**76n. 10**. 977–**50**. 1042–**63**. 1129–**xxii**; **47**.
As.: 149–**86**. 358–**7**. 367–**63**. 376–**63**. 399–**81**. 447–**50**. 598–**36**. 636–**32**; **36**. 731–**47**. 884–**31**; **35**.
Aul.: 47–**42**; **69**. 63–**53**; **65**. 65–**23**; **171**. 174–**xxvii**; **101**. 321–**7**. 620–**76**. 645–**7**. 777–**12**. 780–**16**.
Bacch.: 29–**22**. 78–**101**. 202–**35**, **159**. 203–**15**. 273–**50**. 492–**38**. 474–**50**. 553–**7**. 558–**11**; **14**. 600–**xxi**. 664–**21**. 698–**51**. 720–**93**; **98**. 861–**51**. 901–**23**; **171n. 51**. 983–**51**; **170**. 1063–**64**. 1097–**47**. 1130–**39**. 1157–**7**.
Capt.: 206 b–**67**. 207–**xxvi**; **67**; **171**. 236–**99**. 313–**51**. 360–**45**. 384–**66**. 416–**45**. 557–**30**. 592–**32**; **35**. 964–**12**; **90**.
Cas.: 246–**41**. 378–**22**. 591–**79**. 668–**49**.
Cist.: 26–**39**. 57–**90**. 55–**42**. 57–**57**. 82–**61**. 652–**76**. 748–**16**.
Curc.: 93–**39**. 126–**42**. 153–**42**. 160–**39**. 188–**39**. 311–**39**. 543–**8**. 701–**76**.
Epid.: 274–**12**. 414–**24**. 438–**25**; **27**. 550–**81**.
Men.: 142–**78**. 181–**39**. 207–**10**; **19**. 301–**68**. 349–**72**. 425–**19**. 472–**33**. 478–**51**. 646–**39**. 677–**19**. 679–**48**. 685–**51**. 715–**69**. 744–**21**. 763–**13**. 779–**16**; **90**. 808–**53**; **65**. 828–**30**. 909–**51**. 919–**36**. 947–**19**. 1049–**76**; **77**. 1154–**19**.
Merc.: 156–**78**. 169–**42**. 351–**64**. 431–**101**. 529–**14**. 602–**15**. 606–**7**. 620–**7**.

722–14. 783–88; 97. 880–39. 901–15.

M. G.: 36–88; 101. 201–30. 257–69. 281–49. 377–24. 418–24. 441–7. 809–12. 925–102. 1045–39. 1075–34; 159. 1183–12n. 11; 13. 1222–51. 1289–99.

Most.: 149–xxiv n. 20; xxv; 35; 159. 199–37. 399–66. 459–54; 63; 94; 472–9. 505–45. 572–57. 614–23. 811–39. 830–30. 855–41. 887–41. 969–53; 70; 171. 1040–54; 58. 1172–39.

Pers.: 109–67. 139–21. 292–36. 386–37. 515–67. 640–10; 14; 90. 646–54; 61. 655–35. 661–55n. 27. 812–39. 825–81.

Poen.: 441–85. 556–45. 1027–7. 1064–76; 77. 1087–13. 1167–19. 1185–66. 1319–21.

Pseud.: 18–11; 13. 21–58. 152–42. 153–71. 194–51. 230–51. 262–xxiv n. 20; xxv; 19. 263a–92; 103. 276–19. 330–32; 35. 538–20. 599–15; 159. 641–20. 657–19. 696a–57; 90. 696c–57. 866–15. 955–42. 1184–87; 98; 106. 1312–50.

Rud.: 171–39. 323–79; 80. 329–80. 356–71. 592–22. 614–9. 773–20. 782–51. 869–39. 946–13. 948–23. 956–72. 958–xxii; 67. 964–70. 965–xxii; 54n. 26; 69. 1002–22. 1023–58. 1102–13. 1211–64. 1216–20. 1297–xxii; 69.

Stich.: 106–17. 112–103; 106. 113–21. 116–51. 197–51. 310–31; 37. 410–29n. 1; 36. 541–24. 635–40. 706–12n. 11; 22.

Trin.: 165–52; 62. 236–xxii; 283–34. 350–20. 578–61. 712–64. 748–82. 749–64. 763–82. 847–36. 921–76. 938–17; 53. 959–77. 1123–93n. 17.

Truc.: 261–16. 354–41. 463–86. 499–22. 786–67. 862–101. 931–49.

Pomponius Bononiensis

Ribbeck II, p. 240, 102–8. p. 251, 175–58.

Propertius

General–163n. 14 and n. 16; 168n. 42. I 2, 9–xxiv. I 17, 6–38. II 16, 29–36. II 30, 29–93; 99; 106. II 34, 36–99; 106. II 34, 53, 94–96. II 34, 78–60. III 5, 27 ff.–xxvi; 17; 159; 171n. 51; 172. III 5, 40–100. III 5, 43–91. III 6, 1–47. IV 8, 74–71.

Publilius Syrus

Ribbeck II, p. 339, 348–92; 101.

Sallust

General–167n. 35; 161n. 11; 166n. 31.

Cat.: 23, 5–64; 170. 51, 4–59.

Jug.: 4, 4–167n. 35. 46, 1–48. 85, 25–38.

Terence

General–166n. 30.

Adel.: 154–76n. 10. 195–23. 229–42. 239–82. 309–68. 513–64. 559–41. 604–45. 636–70. 996–xxivn. 21; 101.

Andr.: 356–54. 650–32; 34. 878–23; 171n. 51.

Eun.: 100–21. 238–37. 242–30. 265–36. 338–20. 545–83. 585–65. 670–42. 783–51. 838–83. 919–41. 1037–35.

Hec.: 91–63. 217–49. 223–37. 321–95; 103; 106. 362–45. 405–49. 417–55n. 27; 94. 472–xxii; 33; 92. 513–52. 646–63. 753–20. 874–16.

H. T.: 170–83. 494–20. 638–34. 525–76n. 10. 731–71. 1008–26.

Phorm.: 234–9. 247–43; 159. 358–xxivn. 20; xxvn. 23; xxvi; 36. 380–11; 15. 553–83. 675–78. 737–47. 798–64. 840–22. 987–37. 1048–14.

Pseudo-Terence

Andr. Alter Exitus Suppositicius: 6–126. 14–150. 16–151.

Tibullus: II 4, 18–90; 97.

Turpilius:

Ribbeck II, p. 98, 103–40; p. 98, 104–40.

Varro: General–161n. 11.

Excerpta ex Augustini Libro qui est de Dialectica (Goetz-Schoell, Varro, De Lingua Latina, p. 341, 21)–26. De

Grammatica, Goetz-Schoell, p. 207, 5–27; p. 225–97. p. 230–57.
L. L.: V 31, 140–102. VI 5, 39–58. VIII 1, 1–74. VIII 1, 2–74. VIII 38, 70–6. X 2, 9–104. X 3, 58–72.
R. R.: I 4, 4–73. I 44, 1–48. II 5, 9–92; 104.
Virgil
General–163n. 14, n. 18, and n. 20.
Aen.: I 322–77; 78. I 578–76. II 739–8; 78. VI 615–xxviii n. 25; 60; 167n. 36; 168n. 40. VI 779–xxvii; 41. VI 856–42. VII 207–64. VIII 192–42. IX 269–72; 170.
Culex: 217–40.
Ecl.: IV 52–41. V 7–41.
Georg.: I 57–32; 40; 107n. 2. II 122–59. IV 150–59.
Vitruvius
General–161n. 11. I 73, 17–100. II 1, 7–60. II 6, 4–26. II 8, 16–60. II 8, 19–81. IV Introduction, 2–60. VII 14, 3–81. IX 4, 6–60.

II Later Writings

Aetheria (or Silvia?), Peregrinatio
General–177. V (p. 10, 14)–130. VIII (p. 14, 16)–130. XII (p. 18, 11)–129. XLV (p. 52, 6)–130.
Ammianus Marcellinus
General–177. XIV 6, 22–137. XIV 10–129. XIV 7, 14–134. XIV 10, 15–131. XIV 11, 15–126. XIV 11, 21–129. XVI 11, 12–114. XVI 12, 18–131. XVIII 3, 5–152. XIX 4, 1–131. XX 8, 17–135.
Anthimus–180.
Apollinaris Sidonius–178.
Apollonius–176.
Apuleius
General–172n. 52 and n. 53.
Apol.: 16–133. 42–126. 85–142.
De Deo Socr.: XXIII 173–141.
Met.: I 5, 24–125. I 25, 78–136. II 22, 145–130. III 3, 178–125. III 13, 196–126. V 9, 337–123. V 31, 379–53; 135. VI 5, 391–114; 171n. 51. VIII 1, 505–125. VIII 14, 545–125. IX 30, 650–136. XI 25, 808–125.
Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας, V 268–145.
Asconius
In Cornelianam: 54–89; 144; 171n. 51. 56–111. 62–130. 69–153.
In Milonianam: 39–126.
Pseudo-Asconius–176.
Augustine
General–172n. 52; 178.
Civ. Dei.: I 28–142. II 6–145. V 12–133; 137. VIII 3–113. X 5–137. XVII 20–79; 141.
Conf.: I 13, 20–114. V 8, 14–131. V 9, 16–148. V 14, 24–136; 171.
Serm.: II 7–156. V 7–152. XXII 9–137. XXIV 4–155. XXIV 4–155. XXXVII 10–155. XLV 6–141; 155; 156. XLVI 9–156. LII 13–141. LVII 13–156. LXVI 3–117. CCXXXVI 3–134.
Marcus Aurelius
III 19–120.
Ausonius
General–177.
Ep.: XII 40–139.
Lud.: 104–140.
Avitus–178.
Boethius–179.
Capitolinus, Iulius
Historia Augusta V 9, 10–145. VIII 5, 2–153.
Charlemagne–172n. 52; 180–181.
Claudianus Mamertius
General–178.
De Statu Animae: I 6 (p. 42, 11)–120. I 6 (p. 42, 12)–120. I 9 (p. 49,18)–123. I 19 (p. 69, 1)–147. I 19 (p. 69, 9)–148.
Epilogus (p. 192, 22)–115.
Columella
VIII 5, 14–140. IX 1, 7–141. IX 3, 4–130.

Commodian
General–176.
A.: 59–148. 487–140. 543–146. 736–155. 787–152.
Instr.: I 17, 6–155. I 24, 7–136. I 31, 1–121. I 33, 8–134. I 37, 10–140. II 15, 13–136. II 19, 2–155.
Corippus
General–172n. 52; 179.
Io.: I 103–132. IV 626–149. VIII 207–128.
Iust.: I 181–122.
Cyprian–178.
Ennodius
General–178. 21, 20–127. 83, 19–135. 99, 3–145. 100, 14–135. 106, 26–119. 107, 4–119. 109, 4–128. 113, 5–130. 129, 21–119. 197, 3–123. 206, 36–111. 209, 32–131. 211, 6–135. 229, 3–152. 232, 20–116. 234, 21–121. 246, 1–112. 262, 23–111. 270, 17–128. 275, 24–132. 280, 23–150. 283, 20–152. 291, 22–132. 309, 2–152.
Festus
219–132.
Formulae Andegavenses–169; 173n. 57; 176.
Frontinus–179.
Gellius
9, 2, 5–128. 18, 7, 2–112. 19, 8, 6–151.
Gregory
General–161n. 11; 170; 172n. 52; 179.
De Cursu Stellarum 16 (p. 863, 5)–124.
Glor. Conf.: 5 (p. 751, 14)–148. 8 (p. 753, 25)–128. 20 (p. 759, 12)–146. 20 (p. 760, 4)–120. 38 (p. 771, 25)–153. 49 (p. 777, 20)–121. 58 (p. 781, 25)–146. 77 (p. 794, 13)–151. 96 (p. 809, 20)–123. 108 (p. 818, 17)–124.
Glor. Mart.: 9 (p. 494, 17)–149; 171. 77 (p. 540, 15)–140. 105 (p. 560, 13)–144. 105 (p. 560, 20)–145. 105 (p. 560, 31)–121. 105 (p. 561, 6)–121.
Hist. Fr.: II Prologus (p. 58, 25)–151. II 3 (p. 65, 1)–156. II 9 (p. 74, 15)–114; 171. II 13 (p. 80, 23)–146. III Prologus (p. 108, 13)–146. III 31 (p. 135, 123)–132. IV 11 (p. 148, 2)–156. IV 12 (p. 149, 21)–146. V 7 (p. 199, 1)–146. V 39 (p. 232, 8)–149. V 43 (p. 234, 26)–115. V 49 (p. 240, 6)–146. VI 36 (p. 276, 13)–149. VI 40 (p. 280, 1)–119. VI 40 (p. 280, 7)–121. VI 40 (p. 280, 15)–115. VII 15 (p. 300, 3)–156. VIII 13 (p. 333, 4)–183. VIII 31 (p. 347, 20)–149. VIII 36 (p. 351, 11)–156. IX 2 (p. 359, 22)–128. IX 38 (p. 392, 21)–150. IX 49 (p. 240, 6)–146. X 1 (p. 407, 26)–119. X 2 (p. 410, 4)–150. X 3 (p. 411, 13) 135. X 16 (p. 427, 13)–116. X 19 (p. 433, 10)–146.
Mirac. B. Andr. Apost.: 1 (p. 828, 16)–152; 171. 1 (p. 828, 22)–146. 4 (p. 829, 17)–148. 22 (p. 838, 35)–128. 23 (p. 839, 29)–122. 24 (p. 840, 18)–132. 24 (p. 840, 40)–126. 28 (p. 842, 39)–95; 151.
Passio Sept. Dorm.: 7 (p. 850, 23)–94; 148.
Virt. S. Iul.: 31 (p. 577, 6)–146. 33 (p. 578, 8)–111.
Virt. S. Mart.: I 22 (p. 600, 8)–119. I 23 (p. 600, 15)–145. I 28 (p. 602, 3)–121. I 34 (p. 604, 37)–147. I 36 (p. 605, 25)–119. II 2 (p. 610, 9)–146. II 16 (p. 614, 12)–146. II 16 (p. 614, 21)–150. II 32 (p. 620, 29)–111. II 40 (p. 624, 3)–112. II 55 (p. 628, 3)–156. IV 29 (p. 656, 25)–146.
Vit. Patr.: VI (7) (p. 685, 21)–119. VII (4) (p. 689, 27)–124. VIII (5) (p. 696, 7)–152. VIII (10) (p. 700, 5)–119. IX (p. 700, 2)–146. XX (4) (p. 743, 29)–141.
Hegemonius–179.
Hermerus, Mulom, Chironis
General–179. 38–130. 191–127. 352–129; 136. 451–136. 567–135. 984–132.
Heading in Hermerus, Mulom, Chironis 256–138.

Hilarius–177.
Hyginus 167–134.
Hyginus Gromaticus–179.
Ildefonsus Toletanus–180.
Itala–143; 167n. 38; 179.
Jerome
General–170; 178.
C. Pelag.: II 14–152. III 8–152.
C. Vig.: 5–114.
Ep. 22, 10–133.
In Ephes. pr.–135.
In Gal.: III ad 5, 13–113.
In Naum ad 2, 1–127.
Jordan–179.
Juvenal V 67–121; 163n. 14 and n. 16.
Lactantius–177.
Lampridius, Aelius
Historia Augusta XVI 7, 5–151.
Lucan
General–163n. 14; 163. I 126–114. II 682–12n. 11; 113. IV 201–128. VIII 170–117. VIII 645–136. IX 563–116.
Lucifer of Cagliari–177.
Lucilius (?) Aetna
220–131. 231–153.
Martial
General–163n. 14 and n. 16. III 30, 2–110. III 32, 1–117. III 95, 3–112. V 58, 2–110. VI 88–117. IX 92, 1–135.
Paterculus, Velleius–161n. 10.
Paulus, Ed. 23, 2, 10–87n. 2; 154.
Persius III 67–112; 163n. 14 and n. 16.
Petronius
8, 2–126. 33–139. 44, 2–157. 55, 3–110. 67, 2–110. 71–141. 76, 11–127.
Pliny the Elder, N. H. XXXVII (38) 119–129.
Pliny the Younger–161n. 10.
Priscian
Keil II, p. 421, 20–127. II p. 423, 25–127.
Priscillian–172; 173n. 56; 177.
Prudentius–177.
Quintilian, Inst.
General–161n. 10. IV 5, 1–132; 172. IV 5, 26–128.
Pseudo-Quintilian–176.
Rutilius Lupus II 6–111.
Scaurus, Terentius, in Varro, Reliquorum de Grammatica Librorum Fragm., p. 223–133.
Seneca the Elder
Controversiae II 5, 14–127. X 2, 1–137.
Suasoriae I 10—129; 171.
Seneca the Younger
General–xviii n. 7.
De Clem.: I 13, 3–127.
De Ben.: II 29, 1–122.
De Paupertate 4, 10–134.
Dial.: I 1, 1–115. I 2, 5–156. I 4, 4–134; 172. I 5, 7–151. VII 25, 1–115.
Ep. Mor.: I 4, 8–134. VI 6, 15–116. XIX 7, 7–135. XX 4, 21–129.
Nat. Quaest.: II 22, 3–156. II 29–156. II 53, 3–147. III Praef. 9–150.
III 10, 2–156. III 20, 2–88, 157. V 18, 12–114; 171n. 51. VII 25, 1–153.
Tragedies:
Agam. 414–111; 159. Herc. Fur. 1299–122. Herc. Oet. 365–147. Oed. 211–79; 140. Thy. 772–147. Tro. 811–139.
Siculus Flaccus–179.
Silius Italicus
II 348–122. IV 71–150. XIII 446–31; 123.
Silvia (see "Aetheria")
Statius
Silv. IV 1, 25–142.
Theb.: I 188–118. IV 333–117. V 734–126. XII 260–121. XII 805–118.
Suetonius–161n. 10.
Sulpicius Severus
General–178.
Dial. I 2, 2–155. II 11, 3–140.
Tacitus
General–160n. 5; 161n. 10.

Tertullian
General–**143; 176.**
Ad Mart.: 2–**140.** 6 (end)–**148.**
Ad Nationes: I 1–**135.**
Ad Uxorem I 8–**123.**
Adv. Hermog.: 27–**144.** 45–**137.**
Adv. Praxean 2 (end)–**130.**
Apol.: 6 (beginning)–**140.** 13 (beginning) **140.** 29 (beginning) **154.**
Bapt.: 15 (beginning)–**155.**
Car. Chr.: 3 (p. 894)–**110.** 18–**147.**
Cult. Fem.: I 2–**145.**
Idol.: 24 (end)–**141.**
Praescr.: 8 (beginning)–**134.** 22 (end) –**133.**
Pud.: 13 (end)–**139.**
Virg. Vel.: 6 (beginning)–**141.** 9– **115; 171.**
Tiberianus II 18–**137.**
Trebellius Pollio
Historia Augusta XXII 5, 3–**154.**
Valerius Flaccus VII 120–**117.**
Valerius Maximus 5, 7 ext. 1–**154.**
Heading in Valerius Maximus 8, 1–**138.**
Vegetius
General–**180.** IV 1, 13–**152.** IV 3, 9–**115; 171n. 51.** V, 15, 1–**145.**
Verus to Fronto 116, 12–**157.**
Victor Vitensis–**172n. 52; 178.**
Vopiscus
Historia Augusta XXVI 26,4–**131.** XXIX 8, 9–**130.**
Vulgate–**143; 179.**

Index of Unknown Writers Cited from Modern Collections

Bruns, C. G. and Gradenwitz, O., Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui
S. C. Vellaeanum–**131.**
Buecheler, F., Carmina Latina Epigraphica
73, 1–**99.** 222, 7–**116.** 369, 1–**123.** 450a, 9–**149.** 457, 2–**121.** 565, 5–**154.** 596, 5–**153; 171.** 932, 2–**129.** 984, 2–**144.** 1000, 2–**146.** 1136, 1–**116.** 1381, 13–**147.** 1489–**122.** 1839–**122.**
Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
II 4426–**122.** II 6130–**136.** VI 6435– **147.** VI 9693–**116.** VIII 218–**149.** IX 1527–**99.** IX 5041–**144.** X 4183–**116.** X 5958–**153.** XI 4311–**121.** XII 825– **154.**
Huebner, E., Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae
219–**112.** 255–**132.**
Pirson, J., La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule
–**145, 146, 147, 180.**
Pirson, J., Pamphlets bas latins du VIIe Siècle
–**180.**
Ribbeck, O., Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis
Fragmenta
II p. 122, 62–**40.**